UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernlanguagere11modeuoft

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

VOLUME XI

1916

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100 PRINCES STREET

Paris: LIBRAIRIE HACHETTE ET CIE.
Chicago: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN LITERATURE AND PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MOORE SMITH

AND

J. FITZMAURICE-KELLY

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

VOLUME XI

15 2028

2/9/19

Cambridge:

at the University Press

1916

PB
1
M65
v. 11

CONTENTS.

ARTICLES. PAGE

BAKER, A. T., The Passion of St Andrew 421

BOAS, F. S., Recently Recovered Manuscripts at St John's College, Oxford 298

BRANDIN, LOUIS, Lettres inédites de Gaetano Polidori et de Chateaubriand 195

CARRÉ, JEAN-MARIE, Madame de Staël, H. S. Robinson et Goethe . 316

CHAMBERS, R. W., and GRATTAN, J. H. G., The Text of 'Piers Plowman': Critical Methods 257

COLLISON-MORLEY, LACY, Some English Poets in Modern Italian Literature 48

COOK, ALBERT S., Skelton's 'Garland of Laurel' and Chaucer's 'House of Fame' 9

COOKE, MARGARET W., Schiller's 'Robbers' in England . . . 156

DODDS, MADELEINE HOPE, Political Prophecies in the Reign of Henry VIII 276

JONES, P. M., Influence of Walt Whitman on the Origin of the 'Vers libre' 186

KASTNER, L. E., Concerning the Sonnet of the Sonnet . . . 205

MCNABB, VINCENT, O.P., The Authorship of the 'Ancren Riwle' . 1

MOORE, JOHN ROBERT, The Influence of Transmission on the English Ballads 385

POWELL, C. L., New Material on Thomas Carew 285

PRIEBSCH, R., Deutsche Prosafragmente des XII. Jahrhunderts. II . 321

SELLERS, H., Samuel Daniel: Additions to the Text 28

SUMMERS, MONTAGUE, The Source of Southerne's 'The Fatal Marriage' 149

SYKES, H. DUGDALE, The Authorship of 'The Two Noble Kinsmen' 136

TILLEY, ARTHUR, 'Préciosité' after 'Les Précieuses Ridicules.' I–III 33, 176, 302

TOYNBEE, PAGET, The Laurentian Text (*Cod. Laurent.* XXIX, 8) of Dante's Letter to a Friend in Florence (*Epist.* IX) . . . 61

TUTTLE, EDWIN H., Notes on Romanic Speech-History . . . 450

WHIPPLE, T. K., Isocrates and Euphuism. I–IV 15, 129

WICKSTEED, PHILIP H., On the Disputed Reading in Dante's *Epist.* V, 129, 130 69

WOODBRIDGE, BENJAMIN M., 'Le Grand Alcandre frustré' and 'La Princesse de Clèves 409

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES. PAGE

BENSLY, EDWARD, Pope's 'Rape of the Lock,' Cant. I, 42 . . . 341

BRADLEY, HENRY, Some Emendations of Old English Texts (I. The O.E. 'Edergong'; II. 'Genesis,' 1702–5; III. 'Daniel,' 645–7; IV. 'Leechdoms,' ii, p. 52; V. 'Spider' in O.E.) . . . 212

BRETT-SMITH, H. F. B., Vaughan and D'avenant 76

DAUNT, MAJORIE, 'The Seafarer,' ll. 97–102 337

EMERSON, O. F., 'Iraland' (Alfred's 'Orosius' I, 1); 'Trēson' ('Treason'); 'Afterdiner,' 'Aftermete,' 'Aftersoper' . . . 458

FROST, M. M., Thomas Heywood's Indebtedness to Stow . . . 339

JOHNSTON, OLIVER M., Dante's 'Divina Commedia' and the Medieval Conception of the Comedy 343

MACAULAY, G. C., Shakespeare's 'Tempest,' Act i, sc. II, l. 269 . 75

MARTIN, L. C., A Crashaw and Shelley Parallel 217

NAPIER, A. S., 'Havelok' notes 74

SISAM, KENNETH, The 'Beowulf' Manuscript 335

SMART, JOHN S., Shakespeare's Italian Names 339

SUMMERS, MONTAGUE, Two Passages in Bale's 'John, King of England' 215

TOYNBEE, PAGET, On the Meaning of 'Almus' in Dante's 'Letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy' (*Epist.* v) 342, 464

VISING, JOHAN, Quelques Exemples anglo-normands d'une Négation irrationnelle dans des Phrases concessives 219

WHEELER, G. H., The Method of Formation of O.E. Place-names in '-hāeme,' '-saetan,' '-tūningas' 218

WYATT, ALFRED J., A Passage in 'Salomon and Saturn' . . . 215

TILLEY, M. P., 'A Good Kissing Carrion' (*Hamlet*, II, 2, 182) . . 462

REVIEWS.

Armament of Igor, The Tale of the, ed. by L. A. Magnus (W. J. Sedgefield) 254

Adler, F. H., Herder and Klopstock (John Lees) 502

Arnoldson, T. W., Parts of the Body in Older Germanic and Scandinavian (E. Classen) 368

Assumption of the Virgin, The, ed. by W. W. Greg (E. K. Chambers) . 465

Beowulf with the Finnsburg Fragment, ed. by A. J. Wyatt and R. W. Chambers (J. D. Jones) 230

Bernbaum, E., The Drama of Sensibility (Montague Summers) . . 360

Boas, F. S., University Drama in the Tudor Age (E. K. Chambers) 358

Bossert, A., Herder, sa vie et son œuvre (John Lees) . . . 502

Braga, Th., Historia da Litteratura Portugueza, III (Aubrey F. G. Bell) 507

Brandes, G., Wolfgang Goethe (J. G. Robertson) 504

Bryan, W. F., Studies in the Dialects of the Kentish Charters of the O.E. Period (P. D. Haworth) 232

Bull, F., L. Holberg som Historiker (J. G. Robertson) . . . 109

Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. by Sir A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, XI (G. C. Macaulay) 479

Cambridge Songs, The, ed. by K. Breul (W. E. Collinson) . . 495

Campbell, O. J., The Comedies of Holberg (J. G. Robertson) . . 109

Child, H., Thomas Hardy (Thomas Seccombe) 496

REVIEWS *cont.* PAGE

Cohen, H. L., The Ballade (L. E. Kastner) 240
Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, 1700–1725, ed. by W. H. Durham (H. B. Charlton) 477
Dante Alighieri, the Paradise of, transl. by C. L. Shadwell (J. T. Mitchell) 252
Dodgson, E. S., Keys to the Baskish verb (Aubrey F. G. Bell) . 114
Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association v, ed. by O. Elton (C. J. Battersby) 222
Fansler, D. S., Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose 90
Graves, T. S., The 'Act-Time' in Elizabethan Theatres (W. J. Lawrence) 96
Günzburg, D. G., Russian Prosody (W. J. Sedgefield) . . . 370
Harmer, F. E., Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, ed. by (W. J. Sedgefield) 87
Harper, G. M., William Wordsworth (C. Vaughan) 482
Holberg, L., Comedies transl. by O. J. Campbell and F. Schenck (J. G. Robertson) 109
Holberg, L., Samlede Skrifter, I; XIX, 1 (J. G. Robertson) . . 109
Høst, S., Om Holbergs historiske Skrifter (J. G. Robertson) . . 109
Jacke Jugeler, ed. by W. H. Williams (G. C. Moore Smith) . . 94
Johnston, J. B., Place-names of England and Wales (Allen Mawer) . 92
Jonson, B., A Tale of a Tub, ed. by F. M. Snell (Percy Simpson) . 474
Jordan, J. C., Robert Greene (R. B. McKerrow) 233
Mérimée, H., L'Art dramatique à Valencia (M. A. Buchanan) . . 104
Mérimée, H., Spectacles et Comédiens à Valencia (1580–1630) (M. A. Buchanan) 104
Mosher, J. A., The Exemplum in the early Religious and Didactic Literature of England (R. Warwick Bond) 235
Olsvig, V., Holberg og England (J. G. Robertson) 109
Olsvig, V., Holbergs unge Dage (J. G. Robertson) 109
Quiller-Couch, A., On the Art of Writing (J. H. Fowler) . . . 365
Rand, B., Berkeley and Percival (T. Loveday) 247
Roessler, E. W., The Soliloquy in German Drama (H. Gibson Atkins) . 253
Routh, J., The Rise of Classical English Criticism (H. B. Charlton) . 243
Shaftesbury, Earl of, Second Characters, or The Language of Forms (G. C. Macaulay) 100
Stewart, C. D., Some Textual Difficulties in Shakespeare (G. C. Moore Smith) 98
Stewart, H. F., The Holiness of Pascal (E. A. Wesley) . . . 250
Stoll, E. E., Othello: an Historical and Comparative Study (E. K. Chambers) 466
Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap, vol. v, (A. C. Paues) . . . 85
Sweet, Henry, Collected Papers, ed. by H. C. Wyld (Allen Mawer) . 366
Taylor, R., The Political Prophecy in England (R. Warwick Bond) . 346
Thorndike, A. H., Shakespeare's Theater (W. J. Lawrence) . . 467
Tibal, A., Études sur Grillparzer (G. Waterhouse) 507
Tupper, F., and J. W., Representative English Dramas from Dryden to Sheridan (R. Warwick Bond) 353
Vasconcellos, C. Michaëlis de, A Saudade Portuguesa (Aubrey F. G. Bell) 107

REVIEWS *cont.* PAGE

Vaughan, Henry, Works, ed. by L. C. Martin (G. C. Moore Smith) . 245
Whicher, G. F., The Life and Romances of Mrs Eliza Heywood (Montague Summers) 362
Williams, B. C., Gnomic Poetry in Anglo-Saxon (P. D. Haworth) . 89
Wilson, Sir James, The Dialect of the New Forest (W. J. Sedgefield) . 249
Wilson, Sir James, Lowland Scotch as spoken in The Lower Strath-earn District of Perthshire (W. J. Sedgefield) 249
Zherlitsyn, M., Coleridge and English Romanticism (W. J. Sedgefield) 103

MINOR NOTICES.

Beatrijs, ed. by A. J. Barnouw 119
Blake, W., Selections from the Symbolical Poems of, ed. by F. E. Pierce 511
Cahen, L., and N. Forbes, English-Serbian Phrase-Book . . . 377
Echoes from the Classics, ed. by R. M. Leonard 119
Forbes, N., Russian Grammar; First Russian Book 376
Jamieson, A., Russian Reader 377
Jennings, J. G., Metaphor in Poetry 374
Karrachy-Smitt, M. B., Lessons in Russian 377
Kittredge, G. L., Chaucer and his Poetry 509
Milton's English Poems ('The World's Classics') 117
Neilson, W. A., and A. H. Thorndike, The Facts about Shakespeare 118
Olivero, F., Traduzioni dalla Poesia Anglo-Sassone 509
Polish Authors, Tales from, transl. by E. C. M. Benecke . . . 377
Richardson, G. F., A Neglected Aspect of the English Romantic Revolt 510
Sélincourt, E. de, English Poets and the National Ideal . . . 373
Stewart, H. F., and A. Tilley, The French Romanticists . . . 375
Tamayo y Baus, M., A New Drama, transl. by J. D. Fitzgerald and T. H. Guild 376
Wordsworth, W., Patriotic Poetry, ed. by A. H. D. Acland . . 374
Wordsworth, W., Poems in two Volumes 117
Willoughby, L. A., Samuel Naylor and 'Reynard the Fox' . . 120
Wynne, A., The Growth of English Drama 118
Young, G., Portugal: an Anthology 376

NEW PUBLICATIONS 121, 378

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE 'ANCREN RIWLE.'

THE object of this paper is to prove that (1) the *Ancren Riwle* was written by an English Dominican Friar and (2) this English Dominican Friar was probably Friar Robert Bacon, O.P.

I

THE 'ANCREN RIWLE' WAS WRITTEN BY AN ENGLISH DOMINICAN FRIAR

(1) J. B. Dalgairns, with true historical insight, wrote in 1870: 'The only thing that is certain is that it was written by a Dominican; for the list of prayers which the writer enumerates as having been in use among the lay brethren of his Order are nearly identical with those ordered in the Rule of St Dominic[1].'

(2) As the Dominicans [or Friar Preachers] followed the Rule of St Augustine, which they supplemented by Constitutions divided into two Distinctions, it is at once significant that the *Ancren Riwle* is undoubtedly on the lines of the Rule of St Augustine.

(*a*) It begins, like the rule of St Augustine, with charity and the regulation of the heart (p. 3)[2].

(*b*) It quotes from St Augustine's Rule: 'Nothing must be sought contrary to the rule of the supreme authority' (p. 5).

Again, 'An immodest rule is the messenger of an unchaste heart' (p. 61).

Again, 'Augustine putteth both these in one balance—to desire and to wish to be desired' (p. 61).

[1] *The Scale of Perfection* by Walter Hilton, London, John Philp, 1870. Introductory Essay by J. B. Dalgairns, p. xii.

[2] The references are to Morton's Edition: *The Ancren Riwle* by James Morton, London, The Camden Society, 1853.

(*c*) St Augustine's Rule was almost unique in allowing the use of the bath. 'Lavacrum etiam corpori cum infirmitatis necessitas cogit minime denegetur.'

The *A. R.* says: 'Wash yourselves whenever it is necessary, as often as ye please' (p. 423).

(*d*) The close of the *Riwle* from pp. 425 to 431 is little less than a simple commentary and adaptation of the closing paragraphs of St Augustine's Rule. The parallels are so many that we have not space to set them down. They include the command to read the Rule once a week.

(*e*) It may be added that the only other great western Rule was that of St Benedict. But already there had been a 'Regula Inclusarum' (Anchoresses' Rule) by the Benedictine (i.e. Cistercian) St Aelred. The *A. R.* quotes from it.

(3) The correspondences with the Dominican Rule are manifold.

(*a*) To take the point acutely detected by Dalgairns. The *A. R.* says '*Our lay-brethren* say thus their hours; for Uhtsong (Matins) on werke-days (i.e. ferial days) eight and twenty Pater Nosters; on holy-days (feast days) forty; for even-song, fifteen; for every other time, seven. Before Matins PATER CREDO: kneeling on ferial days and bowing on feast days' (pp. 24, 25). Morton's translation is not quite accurate here; he evidently did not understand or detect the technical phrases.

Let us now contrast this with the office ordered for the Dominican lay-brothers.

	Ancren Riwle (*our* lay-brothers)	Dominican lay-brothers
Matins	Ferial Days 28	28
	Feast Days 40	40
Vespers	15	14
Little hours	7	7

It is quite easy to verify the fact that the only (1) lay-brethren, (2) following the Rule of St Augustine, and (3) saying this office were Dominican lay-brothers. As neither Richard Poore or Simon of Ghent was a follower of St Augustine's Rule or even a religious, neither of them could have written, as the author of the *A. R.* has written, 'Our lay-brothers say thus their hours.... If any of you will do this, she followeth here as in other observances much of our order, and I earnestly advise it' (pp. 25, 27).

(*β*) This is further confirmed: 'Ye should be as our lay-brethren are, partakers of Holy Communion only fifteen times a year' (p. 413). This was the primitive custom of the brothers of the Dominican Order (cf. *Analecta Ord. Praed.*, vol. III, Rome 1897, p. 50).

Even the days fixed are almost identical:

A. R.	1 Mid-winter		2 Between Christmas and Candlemas		3 Candlemas
D. R.	1 Christmas		2 Epiphany		3 Candlemas
A. R.	4 Mid-Lent or Annunciation		5 Holy Thursday		6 Easter
D. R.	4 Between Candlemas and Easter		5 Holy Thursday		
A. R.	7 3rd Sunday after Easter		8 Whitsunday		9 Midsummer
D. R.	6 Between Easter and Whitsunday		7 Whitsunday		8 Between Whitsunday and SS. Peter and Paul
A. R.			10 S. M. Magdalen		11 Assumption
D. R.	9 SS. Peter and Paul		10 S. M. Magdalen		11 Assumption
A. R.	12 Birth of our Lady		13 S. Michael		14 All Saints
D. R.	12 Birth of our Lady		13 S. Denis		14 All Saints
A. R.	15 S. Andrew				
D. R.	15 S. Andrew				

It may be remarked that the English tone of the writer of the *A. R.* s manifested in the substitution of St Michael for St Denis, the Patron f France. In anticipation we may remark that Robert Bacon was one f the leaders against the Angevins.

Again, St Mary Magdalen, who is singled out amongst the women aints, was a patroness of the Dominican Order.

(γ) The writer insists that the Rule shall not bind under vow or in (pp. 7–9 ; 413). Now St Dominic had probably been the pioneer in his movement amongst the religious orders.

(δ) The 'minutio' or blood-letting, four times a year (p. 423).

(ε) The blessing of any drink taken between meals (p. 35).

(ζ) The rule is divided into Distinctions (p. 13). The Second Master-General of the Dominican Order, Jordan of Saxony, divided the Constitutions into two Distinctions[1]. In 1229 he visited Oxford.

(η) The anchoress is told to say office thus: 'At the one psalm you hall stand, if you are at ease, and at the other sit; and always rise up t the Gloria Patri and bow;.... At Placebo you may sit until the Magnificat' (pp. 21, 23). These are the very rubrics still obtaining in he Dominican liturgy.

(θ) The prayers to the Blessed Virgin given on pages 38–40, were o commonly used by Jordan of Saxony, the Second Master-General, hat he was looked upon as their author. The psalms used form an

[1] *Analecta Ord. Praed.*, vol. II, p. 35.

acrostic: **M**agnificat, **A**d Dominum, **R**etribue, **I**n convertendo, **A**d te levavi (MARIA).

(ι) The phrase 'Make your venia,' i.e. prostrate yourself on the ground, is a technical phrase still daily used by Dominicans (p. 47).

(κ) The habit of the anchoress is black and white, i.e. the Dominican colours. 'The black cross is proper to those who are doing penance.... The white cross is appropriate to purity' (p. 51).

Moreover, 'Answer ye any one who asks you concerning your order, whether white or black, say ye are both...and of the order of St James' (p. 11). The Dominicans were called Jacobites from their famous Convent of S. Jacques [James] at Paris.

(λ) The Corpus Christi (Cambridge) MS. contains some further confirmations. I quote from the scholarly article in this Review[1] by its late lamented English Editor, Mr G. C. Macaulay.

f. 16 v°. 'Our friar-preachers and our friars minors,' i.e. our Dominicans and Franciscans. These two mendicant orders were joined in special bonds of friendship. The writer belongs to one of the two. But nowhere in the Rule is there the slightest trace of a Franciscan origin.

Again to quote the collator's remarks[2]: 'We note the desire of the writer to bring all the communities of anchoresses in England under one rule so that the separate societies of London, Oxford, Shrewsbury and Chester may be all as one convent' (p. 463). It is remarkable that the author of the *A.R.* here enumerates four of the earliest communities of friar-preachers in England. He places London first as it was the capital. The other three are enumerated in their order of foundation, Oxford (1221), Shrewsbury (1230), Chester (1235).

Note that Oxford is especially mentioned.

Shrewsbury and Chester were founded by Alexander de Stevensby (Stavensby), Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, one of the most remarkable prelates of England at that time. He had taught the first group of Dominicans, and St Dominic himself in 1214. In 1224 he was consecrated Bishop of Lichfield by the Pope himself Gregory IX. In 1227 when there was a property dispute at Oxford between the friars and the canons of St Frideswide he was appointed delegate of the Pope to decide the matter.

In this same passage from the Corpus Christi MS. we have the sentence: 'If anyone is among you that goeth in singularity and followeth not the convent, but goeth out of the flock that is as in a

[1] Vol. IX, p. 467. [2] *Ibid.* p. 463.

cloister over which Jesus Christ is high prior[1].' It is to be noted that in this paragraph which speaks of convents, the writer uses not the word 'Guardian' which is Franciscan but the word 'Prior,' which is Dominican.

Again in fol. 112 v°[2] we have, 'Let no man eat before you but by your master's leave, general or special, as of friars-preachers and minors special of all others.'

Here again the friar-preachers and friar-minors are singled out. Hospitality is to be given to them especially. This was the rule of the friar-preachers.

II

The 'Ancren Riwle' was written by Friar Robert Bacon, O.P.

1. Wood[3] calls Robert Bacon the first Dominican writer in England. He was born towards the year 1170 and died in 1248.

2. It is clear from the *A. R.* that the writer was an English Friar-Preacher or Dominican. This makes the number of claimants to the authorship very few. It is clear that the author is a man of outstanding literary and theological power; as was Friar Robert Bacon. He was the first Dominican who lectured at Oxford. Even Matthew Paris, no enthusiast for the friars, rises to superlatives in describing Robert Bacon.

3. The Rule has always been associated with Salisbury diocese. It is thought that Friar Robert Bacon succeeded Edmund Rich as Treasurer of Salisbury.

4. The original dialect of the English text is South-Western[4]. The birth-place of the famous Friar Roger Bacon, Franciscan, and nephew of Robert Bacon, was Somersetshire. It is not unlikely that uncle and nephew belonged to the same county; which is typically South-Western.

5. The writer shows a sturdy love for his own country. Is not the *Riwle*, in the vulgar tongue, almost a unique product of the thirteenth century? Robert Bacon was a famous and unconquerable opponent of the Poitevins. It was he who had the courage to preach his mind

[1] *Mod. Lang. Review*, p. 470. [2] *Ibid.* p. 471. [3] *Annals*, I, p. 192.
[4] Mr Macaulay wrote to me: 'The original dialect of the English text was S. Western with a tinge of Midland. This was a kind of standard literary language at one time. See the Lives of St Juliana, St Katherine, etc.'

before Henry III at Oxford. His witticism on that occasion is amongst the best known stories of the thirteenth century. He would be consistently loyal in substituting the feast of St Michael for that of St Denis.

6. The writer belonged to that group of clerics like St Edmund of Canterbury and St Richard of Chichester, his friends both, who were interesting themselves in the religious life of women. St Edmund's famous *Mirror* was written for religious women. Robert Bacon was so closely united with St Edmund that the University of Oxford rested on his witness when it drew up a letter asking the Pope to canonise St Edmund. Innocent appointed Robert Bacon one of the three English clerics to prepare the matter for St Edmund's canonisation, and he wrote what is probably the most valuable life of St Edmund.

7. The author of the *A. R.* shows such a devotion to Jordan of Saxony, Master-General of the Dominicans, who was at Oxford in 1229 and 1230, that he spreads a devotion formed or fostered by Jordan. Now Jordan was at that very time especially occupied in fostering the religious life of women.

8. The author of the *A. R.* is curiously anxious to give the meaning of Hebrew proper names. He seems to be acquainted with Hebrew—a strange accomplishment in the England of the thirteenth century. But Robert Bacon was head of the Dominican hostel for Jews at Oxford. In 1241–2 the sheriff was ordered to pay him 40 shillings for clothing for these Jews. In 1245 the sheriff was to find out from him the whereabouts of an apostate Jew.

9. These points of evidence if circumstantial are convergent and convincing.

But there is one point that seems to make the authorship of Robert Bacon historically certain. The passage in the *Ancren Riwle* is:

(*a*) Ich wot swulne þet bereð boðe togedere
(1) hevi brunie
(2) and here
(3) ibunden mid iren þe middel þauh
(4) and ermes mid brode þicke bendes
Ich wot ec swuche wummon þet þoleð lute less (p. 382).

We have here (1) a CUIRASS, (2) a HAIR-SHIRT, (3) an IRON or METAL instrument, (4) BANDS. Further mention is made of a WOMAN.

This is a sufficiently remarkable passage, and all the more striking because it is the only personal anecdote in the whole Rule.

Now it is a still more remarkable fact that in the MS. life of

St Edmund of Canterbury which Wallace convincingly proves to have been written by Robert Bacon, O.P., a parallel passage occurs:

A military CUIRASS, armed with which his mother often withstood the wiles of the tempter and the uprisings of the flesh, he too bore under his clothes, in order to bring the like conflicts to a like end....During Lent and Advent...he had a HAIR-SHIRT such as the world had not seen....Moreover he BOUND the upper part of this hair-shirt with a thick three-fold BAND (funiculo grossiori et triplici)....Very often he put on a LEADEN scapular of great weight and discomfort[1].

Of St Edmund's mother Robert Bacon writes: 'She wore a heavy and cold CUIRASS under her gown; and a rough and painful HAIR-SHIRT under the cuirass' (p. 591). Moreover when her two sons were studying at Oxford 'She sent them two HAIR-SHIRTS' (p. 594).

The St John's MS. devotes an entire chapter to these instruments of St Edmund's penance.

(*b*) Wallace also prints a life of St Edmund by the monk Eustace. It is significant that this MS., whilst speaking of St Edmund's bodily penance mentions the HAIR-SHIRT, and not the CUIRASS. But he gives the witness of Robert Bacon; and therein is to be found a mention of (1) the CUIRASS, (2) HAIR-SHIRT, (3) BANDS, (4) LEADEN SCAPULAR (p. 561).

These identifications, so minute and detailed, would seem to make it historically probable—or certain ?—that the *Ancren Riwle* was written by Friar Robert Bacon, O.P., the student friend, and biographer of St Edmund of Canterbury.

P.S.—As this article impugns, at least implicitly, the conclusion arrived at by the late Mr Macaulay[2] that the English text of the *A. R.* is a translation of the French, I should like to add that, from first hearing of my view, he was greatly interested in it. He wrote to me on May 9, 1915:

With regard to your paper on the authorship of the *Ancren Riwle* I may tell you I have looked into the question of the other works of Robert Bacon existing in MS. and have found at present the treatise (so-called) *Super Psalterium* (a series of sermons on texts from the Psalms) in the Bodleian Library, and three discourses on the Rogation Days in the British Museum. The former of these works is a rather extensive collection and I have not been able to examine it very far at present, but I hope to do so before long: the latter I have read. The result in my mind is not on the whole unfavourable to his claims, and I have found one rather remarkable parallel, namely the curious etymological reflections on the names of Judith and Holofernes which occur in the *A. R.*, p. 136. If you do not object, I should like to write a short appendix to your article on this part of the subject, which interests me much.

[1] *Life of St Edmund of Canterbury*, London, 1893, p. 602.
[2] *Modern Language Review*, IX, p. 65.

Mr Macaulay in the last fortnight of his life visited Oxford again and searched the *Super Psalterium* for any light it might throw on the authorship of the *A. R.* He did not, I understand, find anything which absolutely clinched the matter to his mind, but he still found nothing to overthrow my theory. It is a matter of regret that the notes he made about this investigation are not forthcoming, and still more that he was not spared to add the appendix to my article which he had contemplated.

VINCENT MCNABB, O.P.

HAWKESYARD PRIORY, RUGELEY.

SKELTON'S 'GARLAND OF LAUREL' AND CHAUCER'S 'HOUSE OF FAME.'

SKELTON'S *Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* is a poem of somewhat over sixteen hundred lines, devoted to the exaltation of Skelton as poet. He, being in the woods near Sheriff Hutton Castle, in Yorkshire, dreams that he sees a pavilion in which are Pallas and the Queen of Fame, the latter of whom accuses Skelton of indolence. After a lengthy discussion, it is agreed between them that Skelton shall have an opportunity to exculpate himself by alleging any works that he has produced. Eolus is then called upon to sound his trumpet, whereat nearly a thousand poets appear, with Phoebus at their head. Among the poets are Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate, who severally compliment Skelton, and are courteously answered by him. Being presented to Pallas, Skelton is sent by her, with the other poets, to the rich palace of the Queen of Fame. Here he sees the queen sitting in state, surrounded by chatterers, and forms the acquaintance of Occupation, Fame's registrar, who brings him forth into a field enclosed by a wall, where he beholds many curious sights. Finally, Occupation leads him up a winding stair, where he finds the Countess of Surrey, surrounded by a bevy of ladies whom she is exhorting to embroider a coronal of laurel for Skelton. After he has complimented the Countess and ten of her ladies, he is summoned by the trumpet of Eolus, and returns with the embroidered garland, wrought with silk and gold, pearls and precious stones. Accompanied by the three English poets, he returns to the Queen of Fame, who requires him to justify his assumption of the laurel. Occupation undertakes to do this for him, and over three hundred lines of the poem are devoted to her enumeration. This ended, the crowd shout their congratulations, and the dreamer awakes.

Though Miss Spurgeon, in her *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion*, where she quotes (pp. 74—5) the passages in which Chaucer is mentioned by name, and notes the references to *Troilus and Criseyde* in lines 871—4, has observed no dependence upon

Chaucer in Skelton's account of the House of Fame, it is evident, on inspection, that such dependence exists. The principal correspondences fall under the following heads:

1. The trumpeter in both poems is Eolus.

Chaucer, 1567—73:

> And with that word she gan to calle
> Hir messanger, that was in halle,
> And bad that he shulde faste goon,
> Up peyne to be blind anoon,
> For Eolus, the god of winde;—
> 'In Trace ther ye shul him finde,
> And bid him bringe his clarioun.'

Skelton, 283—40:

> Call forthe, let se where is your clarionar,
> To blowe a blaste with his long breth extendid;
> Eolus, your trumpet, that knowne is so farre,
> That bararag blowyth in every mercyall warre,
> Let hym blowe now, that we may take a vewe
> What poetis we have at our retenewe;
>
> To se if Skelton wyll put hymselfe in prease
> Amonge the thickeste of all the hole rowte.

2. In Chaucer, the first act of Eolus was that he (1598—1601)

> leet a certeyn wind to go,
> That blew so hidously and hye,
> That hit ne lefte not a skye
> In al the welken longe and brood.

In Skelton, the trumpet of Eolus (260—3)

> longe tyme blewe a full timorous blaste,
> Lyke to the boryall wyndes whan they blowe,
> That towres and townes and trees downe caste,
> Drove clowdes together lyke dryftis of snowe.

3. Chaucer, in describing the House of Fame, says (1184)

> Al was of stone of beryle,

and later refers (1288—9) to

> these walles of beryle,
> That shoon ful lighter than a glas.

In Skelton's palace (467),

> Of birrall enbosid wer the pyllers rownde.

4. Of Chaucer's House of Fame,

> Bothe castel and the tour,
> And eek the halle, and every bour, (1185-6),

the poet says (1167—73) that

> alle the men that ben on lyve
> Ne han the cunning to descryve
> The beautee of that ilke place,
> Ne coude casten no compace
> Swich another for to make,
> That mighte of beautee be his make,
> Ne [be] so wonderliche ywrought.

Skelton describes (458—463) how he

> was brought
> Into a palace with turrettis and towris,
> Engolerid goodly with hallis and bowris,
> So curiously, so craftely, so connyngly wrowght,
> That all the worlde, I trowe, and it were sought,
>
> Suche an other there coude no man fynde.

5. Of Chaucer's House of Fame we are told (1343—6, 1350—5) that

> every wal
> Of hit, and floor, and roof and al
> Was plated half a fote thikke
> Of gold. . . . .
> And they wer set as thikke of nouchis
> Fulle of the fynest stones faire,
> That men rede in the Lapidaire,
> As greses growen in a mede;
> But hit were al to longe to rede
> The names; and therfore I pace.

The palace-gates in Skelton's poem were (469—473)

> Enlosenged with many goodly platis
>
> Of golde, entachid with many a precyous stone;
> An hundred steppis mountyng to the halle,
> One of jasper, another of whalis bone;
> Of dyamauntis pointed was the rokky wall.

6. Chaucer describes his House of Fame as full of minstrels, among whom was Orpheus (1193—1207):

> And eek in ech of the pinacles
> Weren sondry habitacles,
> In whiche stoden, al withoute—
> Ful the castel, al aboute—
> Of alle maner of minstrales,
> And gestiours, that tellen tales
> Bothe of weping and of game,
> Of al that longeth unto Fame.
> Ther herde I pleyen on an harpe
> That souned bothe wel and sharpe,
> Orpheus ful craftely,
> And on his syde, faste by,
> Sat the harper Orion
> And Eacides Chiron
> And other harpers many oon.

At the sounding of the trumpet, it happened, according to Skelton (269—273), that

> there come in wonderly at ones
> A murmur of mynstrels, that suche another
> Had I never sene, some softer, some lowder;
> Orpheus, the Traciane, herped meledyously
> Weth Amphion, and other Musis of Archady.

7. Speaking of the House of Rumor, Chaucer tells us (2043—54 : cf. 1956—61) that

> every wight that I saugh there
> Rouned ech in otheres ere
> A newe tyding prevely,
> Or elles tolde al openly
> Right thus, and seyde: 'Nost not thou
> That is betid, lo, late or now?'
> 'No,' quod [the other], 'tel me what;'—
> And than he tolde him this and that,
> And swoor therto that hit was sooth—
> 'Thus hath he seyd'—and 'Thus he dooth'—
> 'Thus shal hit be'—'Thus herde I seye'—
> 'That shal be found'—'That dar I leye.'

Correspondingly, Skelton has (498—502):

> How doth the north? what tydyngis in the sowth?
> The west is wyndy, the est is metely wele;
> It is harde to tell of every mannes mouthe;
> A slipper holde the taile is of an ele,
> And he haltith often that hath a kyby hele.

8. Chaucer's crowd is unmannerly (2149—54):

> And whan they were alle on an hepe,
> Tho behinde gonne up lepe,
> And clamben up on othere faste,
> And up the nose on hye caste,
> And troden faste on othere heles,
> And stampe, as men don after eles.

Compare this with Skelton (505—6):

> Sir, I pray you, a lytyll tyne stande backe,
> And lette me come in to delyver my lettre.

9. Fame is thus described in Chaucer's poem (1360—5; cf. 1394—5; 1415—6):

> But al on hye, above a dees,
> Sitte in a see imperial,
> That maad was of a rubee al,
> Which that a carbuncle is ycalled,
> I saugh, perpetually ystalled,
> A femynyne creature

And thus Skelton (481—8):

> Unto this place all poetis there did sue,
> Wherin was set of Fame the noble Quene,
> All other transcendynge, most rychely besene,
>
> Under a gloryous cloth of astate,
> Fret all with orient perlys of Garnate,
> Encrownyd as empresse of all this worldly fate,
> So ryally, so rychely, so passyngly ornate,
> It was excedyng byyonde the commowne rate.

10. According to Chaucer (1532—41), Fame is arbitrary in replying to her suitors:

> And also sone
> As they were come into the halle,
> They gonne doun on kneës falle
> Before this ilke noble quene,
> And seyde, 'Graunte us, lady shene,
> Ech of us, of thy grace, a bone!'
> And somme of hem she graunted sone,
> And somme she werned wel and faire;
> And somme she graunted the contraire
> Of hir axing utterly.

And Pallas, in Skelton's poem, says to Fame (176—180):

> But whome that ye favoure, I se well, hath a name,
> Be he never so lytell of substaunce,
> And whome ye love not ye wyll put to shame;
> Ye counterwey not evynly your balaunce;
> As wele foly as wysdome oft ye do avaunce.

Cf. Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame*, pp. 120 ff.

Of minor significance are the following.

Chaucer has (1106—8):

> Thou shalt see me go, as blyve,
> Unto the nexte laure I see,
> And kisse hit, for hit is thy tree;

with which may be compared Skelton, 320—2:

> Yet, in remembraunce of Daphnes transformacyon,
> All famous poetis ensuynge after me
> Shall were a garlande of the laurell tre.

Skelton's Palace of Fame is a mile in circumference (489), while Chaucer's House of Rumor is sixty miles long (1978).

Chaucer's House of Rumor has a thousand holes in the roof (1949) through which sound may issue, and the field in Skelton (574) has a thousand gates.

Reminiscences of other Chaucerian poems occur in Skelton's *Garlande* as follows:

compared with Chaucer, *Prologue*, 35:

> But natheles, whyl I have tyme and space.
>
> Above in the top a byrde of Araby,
> Men call a phenix; (667—8)

with *Book of the Duchess*, 982:

> The soleyn fenix of Arabye.
>
> Apollo that whirllid up his chare, (1471)

with *Squire's Tale*, 663:

> Apollo whirleth up his char so hye;

cf. *The Flower and the Leaf*, 1—2.

ALBERT S. COOK.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

ISOCRATES AND EUPHUISM.

THE distinctive feature of euphuism is the use of the figures known as σχήματα λέξεως. There are other traits, such as the use of proverbs, the exploitation of classical history and myth, the frequent citation of the marvels of plant and animal life and of mineralogy, and the constant use of antithesis[1]. But all these are plainly subordinate to one main purpose, namely, to produce a certain pattern of sound by means of the figures just mentioned; and some of them are only the means by which this end is attained.

What is the source whence these figures came to Lyly? What are the models of euphuism? The immediate sources have been much studied; and a few years ago there was a substantial concurrence of all scholars in Landmann's theory that the figures came from the imitation of the Spaniard Guevara by Pettie, North, and Lyly. Now Feuillerat has thrown doubt on this theory, and the relation between Guevara and English prose style must once more be carefully studied. Various other questions are also in need of further investigation, such as the extent and exact area of the diffusion of euphuistic rhetoric in the early part of the sixteenth century.

Meanwhile another and a more important question has also been discussed by all scholars from Landmann to Feuillerat; namely, what is the ultimate source of euphuism? If it comes from Guevara, whence did he have it? If it is a common possession of whole classes of English prose-writers in the sixteenth century, how did it come to them? On this question there is still a complete harmony of opinion. Landmann declared that euphuism was an outgrowth of humanistic study of the style of Greek and Latin orators, and especially of Cicero. Bond agrees; and Feuillerat, following Norden, has lately stated Landmann's con-

[1] Important as these things are, they lie outside the special province of this paper—although it may be noted that Lyly's continuance of the tradition of the medieval bestiaries, lapidaries, etc., provides a sort of confirmation of the thesis here set forth, by showing that the taste for euphuism had its roots in the middle ages, rather than in the humanistic study of the classics.

clusion in much more positive form, laying special emphasis upon the Greek orator Isocrates. He cites many evidences of Isocrates' great popularity among humanistic teachers in England, such as Elyot and Ascham, and states without reservation his belief that euphuism is chiefly due to the Greek writer's vogue among these early scholars.

The purpose of the present paper is to re-examine the question of the ultimate sources of Lyly's rhetoric, or rather to re-open the question and to submit the accepted conclusion to the same kind of sceptical inquiry as that which Feuillerat has turned upon the question of immediate sources. It does not aim to substitute another theory for that which is now held; the task of reconstruction must be left in abeyance for the present. It proposes merely to raise doubts concerning Feuillerat's theory before it shall have hardened into a tradition and passed into general circulation. It does not even attempt to examine thoroughly the theory of the classical and humanistic origin of euphuism —the possible influence of Cicero, for instance, does not come within its ken. It is true that the whole theory may stand or fall with Isocrates, but for the present purpose this need not be assumed. I merely ask whether Isocrates was or could have been the main cause, or a main cause, of the popularity of the σχήματα in sixteenth-century English. The conclusion reached, if it is accepted, will be of value only in a negative way, though perhaps some light may incidentally be thrown upon the subject of Greek study in the sixteenth century and its influence upon culture[1].

Landmann was the first to mention Isocrates. But in *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, Norden first expounded the hypothesis of his predominant part in the history of euphuism[2]. According to him, Roger Ascham introduced the study of Isocrates into England, where the Greek rhetorician enjoyed an immense popularity. Ascham also led the way in imitating Isocrates, first in his Latin style and then in the vernacular, as it was Ascham's avowed purpose to develop in English a prose modelled on the classics. He had a special liking for the parallel or

[1] The whole question of the sources of euphuism is treated by Prof. M. W. Croll of Princeton University in the introduction to his forthcoming edition of *Euphues*, and the present paper is intimately related to the larger argument there set forth. I am glad to be able to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor Croll for his direction and advice.

[2] The works most frequently cited in the following paper are:
Ascham, Roger, *The Whole Works*, ed. J. A. Giles, London, 1865, 3 vols. in 4.
Elyot, Sir Thomas, *The Boke Named The Governour*, ed. H. H. S. Croft, London, 1880, 2 vols.
Feuillerat, Albert, *John Lyly*, Cambridge, 1910.
Norden, Eduard, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig, 1898, 1 vol. in 2.
Watson, Foster, *English Grammar-Schools to 1660*, Cambridge, 1908.
Wilson, Thomas, *The Arte of Rhetorique*, ed. G. H. Mair, Oxford, 1909.

antithetic sentence-structure which he found in Isocrates. The rest of his countrymen followed Ascham's lead, so that by the time Lyly came to write his novel, the only reputable English style which he found ready to his hand was this which Ascham had based on Isocrates[1]. In short Norden would have us believe that in the peculiar sentence-structure which Ascham derived from Isocrates lie the essentials of the euphuistic figures.

In his study *John Lyly*, Feuillerat substantially agrees with Norden. Having described Isocrates' vogue in England, he says: 'One can, then, with sufficient probability grant to Isocrates the honour of having taught the English to use the figures to which Gorgias has given his name[2]'—that is, of having taught the English to use the euphuistic figures (we may take the terms euphuistic and 'Gorgian' as synonymous). Feuillerat further characterises euphuism as an English offshoot of the Gorgianic school and states that because Isocrates had used these Gorgian, or euphuistic, figures most successfully, and because he had a great vogue, he seems to have been the writer who led the English stylists to adopt these figures[3]. Feuillerat also notes, in passing, that the contemporary English rhetorics, Sherry's, Wilson's, Cox's, probably assisted in familiarising English authors with these figures[4], but in the main he is content with developing Norden's theory.

From Isocrates, then, in the first part of the sixteenth century the English humanists, particularly Ascham, learned the euphuistic figures, which were assiduously cultivated until they flowered in Lyly's novel.

[1] Norden, *l. c.*, vol. II, pp. 799—802: 'Vor allem aber gefiel er in England, wo ihn Roger Ascham (†1568), der bekannte Humanist, einbürgerte....Von seinem lateinischen Stil, in dem jeder die affektierte Nachahmung des Isokrates oder Cicero deutlich fühlt, übertrug er diese Manier nun auch auf die englische Sprache. Denn er hatte die ausgesprochene Absicht, in diese die Feinheiten der antiken Diction einzubürgern....Demgemäss überträgt er nun auch jenes Stilornament des parallelen (antithetischen) Satzbaus, das ihm als das wichtigste von allem erschien, in massloser Weise in seine englische Prosa.... Wenn man diese Verhältnisse überblickt, so dürfte man folgender Schlussfolgerung nicht aus dem Wege gehen können. Als John Lyly im J. 1579 seinen Roman schrieb, verwendete er in ihm den Stil, der damals infolge einseitiger, durch die Humanisten aufgebrachter Nachahmung des Isokrates (und Cicero) als der einzig feine galt und aus dem Latein der Humanisten auf die modernen Sprachen übertragen wurde.'

[2] P. 462: 'Parmi les écrivains que je viens d'énumérer, il y en a un qui, dès l'origine, eut en Angleterre une vogue toute particulière: Isocrate....On peut donc avec assez de vraisemblance accorder à Isocrate l'honneur d'avoir enseigné aux Anglais l'usage des figures dites de Gorgias.'

[3] P. 469: 'L'euphuisme, comme la plupart des mouvements de style européens qui se produisirent au temps de la Renaissance, est dû à l'imitation des littératures antiques; plus particulièrement, il constitue un rejeton anglais de l'école de Gorgias. Isocrate, parce qu'il avait employé les figures de Gorgias avec le plus de succès et aussi parce qu'il eut une très grande vogue, semble avoir été l'écrivain qui fit adopter ces figures par les stylistes anglais.'

[4] Pp. 463 f.

This is the gist of the present opinion. In estimating the weight of the argument in its favour, I shall (i) compare Isocrates' style with Lyly's; (ii) inspect the critical comment of the sixteenth century itself on the question of his style and influence; (iii) taking the whole bulk of early sixteenth-century prose into account, see whether the knowledge and use of the euphuistic figures coincides at all with the humanist movement, and especially with the knowledge of Greek; (iv) compare the common and ordinary style of the period with the style of Isocrates' imitators, in order to define Isocrates' influence.

I.

At first sight Lyly and Isocrates seem so far apart that most readers would not suspect a connexion between them. Lyly's style has been described for us by Landmann, Child, Bond, and Feuillerat. The following passage will do as well as another for the purpose of illustration:

> Though the beginning of loue bring delyght, the ende bringeth destruction. For as the first draught of wine doth comfort the stomacke, the seconde inflame the lyuer, the thirde fume into the heade, so the first sippe of loue is pleasaunt, the seconde perilous, the thirde pestilent. If thou perceiue thy selfe to be entised with their wanton glaunces, or allured with their wicked guyles, eyther enchaunted with their beautie or enamoured with their brauerie, enter with thy selfe into this meditation. What shall I gayne if I obtayne my purpose? nay rather what shall I loose in winning my pleasure? If my Lady yeelde to be my louer is it not lykely she will bee an others lemman? and if she be a modest matrone my labour is lost. This therfore remayneth that eyther I must pine in cares, or perish with curses[1].

Here we find instances of the chief traits of the euphuistic style: the echoing chime of similar sounds, the playing upon words, the balance and antithesis of phrases and clauses combined with ingenious and elaborate alliteration and rime. At this point we must have recourse to the terms of technical rhetoric, a science which, however neglected it is nowadays, still affords the only means for the accurate definition of a prose style—at least of the sixteenth century. To give Lyly's schemes their rhetorical names, they are parison[2], paromoion[3], paronomasia[4], and antithesis[5]—the four figures which by ancient

[1] Lyly, *Complete Works*, ed. R. W. Bond, Oxford, 1902, I, p. 248.

[2] The use of parallel clauses or phrases, in which noun balances noun, adjective balances adjective, etc. Throughout the present paper the term 'parison' is used to indicate only this balance, when it is not combined with alliteration or other sound-similarity.

[3] Similarity of sound between the parallel words in parallel phrases or clauses.

[4] Play on words; the use of words similar or identical in sound but different in meaning.

[5] There are two kinds of antithesis. One is a figure of thought, a sharp contrast between ideas. Here, however, I refer to that variety which is a word-scheme: the opposition of balanced phrases or clauses.

tradition are known as the Gorgianic figures. It is not, however, the simple fact that Lyly uses these schemes, so much as the peculiar way in which he uses them, that is significant. He seems to regard them as the one thing needful for an elegant and artistic prose style; he seems to delight in them as a savage does in bright glass beads. There is indeed something naive—and highly characteristic of sixteenth-century England—in his innocence of restraint. It is natural that his favourite should be the most artificial, and I must add inartistic, of them all—paromoion. With this predilection his characteristic sentence-structure comes as a corollary. His phrase-length is short, his rhythm choppy; his series of sharp verbal oppositions remind one of what has been called Macaulay's 'yelping staccato': 'le tic-tac métronomique et mécanique,' Feuillerat calls it. This is inevitable; for Lyly's delight in paromoion precludes any really rhythmic structure, which requires a highly developed taste, a strict restraint and subordination of parts, a feeling for the whole sentence as the unit of composition. It is true that Lyly writes long sentences, involving many subordinate clauses and phrases; such sentences, however, are only series of balances and antitheses. He does not achieve that long rise and fall which is characteristic of the true periodic structure.

It happens to be precisely the feeling for the whole sentence as a unit which is Isocrates' distinguishing mark. As all authorities agree[1], it is a comparatively simple matter to define his style. It is smooth, pure, correct, polished, even monotonous in its perfection, its smoothness being its most distinguishing feature. The rhythm flows on without jerk or jar; clause is closely knitted to clause; every sentence is rounded to a period, each segment of which is neither longer nor shorter than the just mean. It does not tolerate short and choppy phrases: instead, it substitutes large, full, flowing clauses, and lengthens out the period. The schemes which Isocrates uses are isocolon, antithesis, parison, and paromoion. Of these, isocolon, which means only that the component clauses of a sentence contain each approximately the same number of syllables, without, however, any close parallelism in structure, is by far the most prevalent in Isocrates, pervading practically all his work. His use of it is peculiar in that the equal members are of remarkable length. As parison is a more striking figure, he is less free with it, though it occurs frequently; his antitheses

[1] Blass, F. W., *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, Leipzig, 1892, 3 vols. in 4, vol. II, pp. 101 ff., esp. pp. 130 ff. Jebb, R. C., *Attic Orators*, London, 1876, 2 vols., vol. II, pp. 57 ff. Croiset, A. and M., *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*, Paris, 1900, vol. IV, pp. 487 ff. Norden, *l. c.*, vol. I, pp. 113–6.

usually fall under this head. Paromoion, being still more striking, is still less frequent. In general, his use of these schemes is not to be exaggerated; he is distinguished from Gorgias and the others who preceded him, and also from such of his followers as St Augustine, by his moderation. With him the figures are always subdued, subordinated to the larger rhythm of the sentence; they are always incidental, never regarded as the chief mark of a good style.

A typical example of Isocrates is the following from the *Ad Nicoclem*:

Τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ποίει μὲν ὡς οἱ πρόγονοι κατέδειξαν, ἡγοῦ δὲ θῦμα τοῦτο κάλλιστον εἶναι καὶ θεραπείαν μεγίστην, ἂν ὡς βέλτιστον καὶ δικαιότατον σαυτὸν παρέχῃς· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐλπὶς τοὺς τοιούτους ἢ τοὺς ἱερεῖα πολλὰ καταβάλλοντας πράξειν τι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀγαθόν. τίμα ταῖς μὲν ἀρχαῖς [τῶν φίλων] τοὺς οἰκειοτάτους, ταῖς δ' ἀληθείαις αὐταῖς τοὺς εὐνουστάτους. φυλακὴν ἀσφαλεστάτην ἡγοῦ τοῦ σώματος εἶναι τήν τε τῶν φίλων ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν τῶν πολιτῶν εὔνοιαν καὶ τὴν σαυτοῦ φρόνησιν· διὰ γὰρ τούτων καὶ κτᾶσθαι καὶ σώζειν τὰς τυραννίδας μάλιστ' ἄν τις δύναιτο[1].

In these three sentences we find seven instances of isocolon, three of parison, and two of paromoion. In the following translation I have tried, even at the expense of good English idiom, to preserve the rhythm, the number and equality of syllables, and the striking resemblances of sound, which are found in the Greek:

As concerns the gods, follow what your ancestors have established, but consider this the finest sacrifice and the greatest service, if you show yourself the noblest and the justest that is possible; for there is more hope that such a one as this will receive some good at the hands of the gods than those who sacrifice many a victim. Bestow positions of power upon your friends who are closest, but the reality of it upon those who are firmest. The most unfailing protection of your safety consider the virtue of your friends and the favour of your subjects and your own wisdom; for by these things chiefly it is possible both to gain and to keep the sovereignty.

For the purpose of comparison with the *Euphues*, however, a better example would be a passage from sixteenth-century literature in which the author has caught the Isocratic manner. The following are good instances:

Yet where these vertues and qualities be seperately in sondry parsones assembled, may well be parfecte concorde, but frendshippe is there seldome or neuer; for that, whiche the one for a vertue embraceth, the other contemneth, or at the leste neglecteth. Wherfore it semeth that wherein the one deliteth, it is to the other repugnaunt unto his nature; and where is any repugnaunce, may be none amitie, sens frendshippe is an entier consent of willes and desires[2].

Isocrates, concerning the lesson of oratours, is euery where wonderfull profitable, hauynge almost as many wyse sentences as he hath wordes: and with that is so swete and delectable to rede, that, after him, almost all other seme unsauery and tedious; and in persuadynge, as well a prince, as a priuate persone, to vertue, in two very litle and compendious warkes, wherof he made the one to kynge Nicocles, the other to his frende Demonicus wolde be perfectly kanned, and had in continual memorie[3].

[1] 18 e—19 b, Teubner text. [2] Elyot, *The Governour*, vol. II, p. 124.
[3] *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 74.

I do not know whether the modern reader is more struck, in the foregoing and in the passage quoted from *Euphues*, by the similarities or by the differences. Both are obvious enough. Lyly and Isocrates are both fond of balanced structure set off with sound-resemblance; that is, they both use antithesis, parison, and paromoion. Our ears are so unaccustomed to these effects that we note their presence at once; to some of us they may seem the outstanding features of both styles. But one who has done any considerable reading in the sixteenth century will also mark important unlikenesses; indeed, he will feel a strong contrast between the two manners.

In part this is due to the fact that Lyly and Isocrates do not favour all the same schemes and do not use the same schemes in the same way. Paronomasia, frequent in Lyly, is not found in Isocrates; while isocolon (i.e., equality of syllables among the clauses, without balance in structure or similarity of sound), which practically governs the Isocratic style, has no attractions for Lyly. This lack of isocolon in *Euphues* is significant because it indicates the real fundamental difference between the two writers. Isocolon differs from all the other schemes in that it makes its effect on the reader largely without his being conscious of the cause of it. He feels the smoothness and rhythm of the sentence, but until he begins to count the syllables he does not realise the presence of this figure. Now Lyly had no use for a figure which is so easily overlooked; he delights in his tricks of rhetoric and expects his reader to enjoy them too—and in his own generation he was not disappointed.

With Isocrates the case is quite the opposite. He may, and does, use parison and paromoion to add a prettiness or piquancy to his style, but he never forgets that such things do not in themselves make good writing. He bases his real claim on the agreeable qualities of smoothness, finish, lucidity, and flowing rhythm. Thus the essential difference between the Greek and the Englishman is one of aim, of purpose and ideal. The two authors are attempting quite different and incompatible achievements. Isocrates would have thought Lyly's effects of sound cheap and tawdry, and the snapping of his phrases the sign-manual of a bad stylist; while Lyly evidently had no appreciation for the charms of smooth rhythm and the virtues of stylistic modesty and restraint.

The foregoing considerations, I fully realise, do not disprove the contention of Feuillerat and Norden. In spite of all differences, it may be possible that Ascham learned the euphuistic figures from Isocrates, and that in the course of their domestication in England

they suffered a sea-change. However, I do wish to emphasise the extent of this change, to point out that on the face of the matter it is far from evident that euphuism is a product of the Isocratic school. Now there are only two possible explanations of this strange shift which has taken place between Isocrates and Lyly in the ideal and practice of style. One, of course, is that there is no real connexion between them. The other, which fits in with Norden's theory, is that the sixteenth century radically and grievously misunderstood Isocrates' purpose and performance.

II.

Fortunately the writers of the sixteenth century have left us enough explicit criticisms, both of Isocrates and of those whom they recognised as his imitators, to prove that they had as just and as accurate a conception of what he stood for as we have ourselves, and that furthermore, so far from deriving euphuism from him, they saw the Isocratic and the euphuistic as clearly and strongly opposed tendencies. This seems to me to render quite impossible Norden's thesis. Surely if Ascham and his fellow-humanists had introduced the style *par excellence* of the century and if England had derived this style at all from Isocrates, the critics of the time would not have been altogether unconscious of the fact; surely, at least, they would not have asserted the contrary. Norden himself has vindicated successfully the accuracy and intelligence of the humanist critics.

The first references which bear on our subject are three in Erasmus' *Ciceronianus*, published in 1528. He says: 'Isocrates is praised for structure and rhythm. He who strives over-zealously for this quality runs the risk of becoming wearisome through too nice a disposition of his words and of forfeiting confidence through the display of his art[1].' Again: 'Gregory I approaches more closely than does St Ambrose to Cicero, but his speech flows sluggishly, as if it were subservient to the Isocratic structure—a thing which is foreign to Cicero. For as a boy in the schools he acquired this habit[2].' And concerning Sir Thomas

[1] Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, Leyden, 1703, vol. I, p. 990: 'Applauditur Isocratis structurae numerisque. Huc qui vehementer annitatur, in periculum veniet, ne superstitione compositionis sit molestus, et artificii jactatione fidem amittat.'

[2] Erasmus, *l.c.*, p. 1008: 'Et hic propius accedit ad M. Tullium quam Ambrosius, sed fluit lutulentus, et Isocraticae structurae quasi servit oratio, quod est a Cicerone alienum. Sic enim puer in scholis assueverat.'

More: 'Yet the style which he [More] has acquired tends rather to Isocratic structure and dialectic subtlety than to the copious river of Ciceronian diction, although he is not at all inferior to Cicero in culture[1].'

Obviously Isocrates is no favourite with Erasmus. However, in the first citation above he shows that he appreciates Isocrates' rhythm and polish, although he suggests that these virtues may be carried to excess. In the second and third extracts he seems to use the phrase 'Isocratic structure' as a generic term, as we say, for instance, 'Gorgianic figures,' and to mean by it antithesis, balance, parison, wherever found, whether employed after Isocrates' peculiar fashion or not. That such is his intention seems clear from his reference to Gregory's having learned this structure at school and from his using 'dialectic subtlety' as a practically synonymous phrase. Thus he imputes this 'Isocratic structure,' but not the Isocratic rhythm and polish, to the mediaeval dialecticians and to Sir Thomas More. If this explanation is correct, Erasmus has only taken a polite way of saying that More's style retains decided traces of mediaevalism; it is not implied that More had any of the features of the genuine Isocratic style or that he imitated Isocrates—merely that both More and Isocrates use the schemes of antithesis, balance, and parison. Certainly one cannot infer from Erasmus that More must have learned the Gorgianic figures from Isocrates.

Moreover, Erasmus knew and cared little or nothing about English prose style. In the foregoing, he refers, of course, to More's Latinity. And as for More himself, belonging as he did to the earliest period of the English Renaissance, he demanded of the classics rather a philosophy of life than a manner of speaking; he was a man of affairs and not primarily a stylist; the theory of imitation in his day had taken little or no hold upon the English; and he was so indifferent to the vernacular as to write the *Utopia* in Latin. Therefore Erasmus' comment has little value for us.

Sir Thomas Elyot, the next in line, bears directly on our problem. He was an enthusiastic admirer of Isocrates. I have already quoted the passage from *The Governour* in which he calls Isocrates 'wonderfull profitable' and 'so swete and delectable to rede, that, after him, almost all other seme unsauery and tedious.' But more important for us is the

[1] Erasmus, *l.c.*, p. 1013: 'Et tamen dicendi genus quod assequutus est magis vergit ad Isocraticam structuram ac dialecticam subtilitatem, quam ad fusum illud Ciceronianæ dictionis flumen, quanquam urbanitate nihilo M. Tullio inferior est.'

translation he made in 1534 of Isocrates' *Ad Nicoclem*, which he called the *Doctrinal of Princes*, and in the foreword to which he says:

> This little booke (whiche in mine opinion) is to be compared in counsaile and short sentence with any booke, holy scripture excepted, I haue translated out of greeke, not presumyng to contende with theim, whiche haue doone the same in latine; but to thintent onely that I wolde assaie, if our Englisshe tunge mought receiue the quicke and propre sentences pronounced by the greekes. And in this experience I haue founde (if I be not muche deceiued) that the forme of speakyng, vsed of the Greekes, called in greeke, and also in latine, Phrasis, *muche nere approcheth to that, whiche at this daie we vse*: than the order of the latine tunge: I meane in the sentences, and not in the wordes[1].

The words I have italicised are noteworthy because they indicate that Isocrates' style had some elements in common with the ordinary English style of 1534, although the style then in general use could not have been founded on the Athenian rhetorician. In a later section of this paper we shall have to consider what were the elements common to all prose styles of the early sixteenth century, and it will be well to bear Elyot's remark in mind. Apart from this resemblance, Elyot was chiefly impressed by the liveliness of Isocrates' sentences and by his delectable sweetness, and in order to acquire these qualities he endeavoured to adapt Isocrates' manner of expression to the vernacular. In Elyot, then, we have an authentic case of Isocratic influence.

Much the same is true of Ascham. He yields to none in his praise of Isocrates. In a letter to Bishop Day he refers to him as 'my Isocrates' and quotes from the *Ad Nicoclem*[2]. Ascham's letters, the *Toxophilus*, and the *Schoolmaster* contain many such references, all laudatory, of which only two need be quoted here. One is from the *Schoolmaster*, where the author speaks of 'copiam Platonis, venustatem Xenophontis, suavitatem Isocratis, vim Demosthenis[3].' The other is in the well-known letter to Sturm in which Ascham tells of the education of the Princess Elizabeth:

> The beginning of the day she always devotes to the New Testament in Greek, then she has been reading select orations from Isocrates and Sophocles' tragedies.... Language called forth by the subject, pure in its correctness, shining in its clarity, she praises freely. She admires only restrained figures and skilfully joined antitheses happily opposed[4].

[1] Quoted by Feuillerat, p. 462, n. 6. It is worth remark, in passing, that the expression 'short sentence' means 'pithy maxim' and not, as Feuillerat translates it, 'la brièveté des phrases.'

[2] Ascham, vol. II, p. 323.

[3] *Ibid.*, IV, p. 227.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, p. 192: 'Exordium diei semper Novo Testamento Graece tribuit, deinde selectas Isocratis orationes, et Sophoclis tragoedias legebat....Orationem ex re natam, proprietate castam, perspicuitate illustrem, libenter probat. Verecundas translationes, et contrariorum collationes apte commissas,.et feliciter confligentes, unice admiratur.'

The evident approval with which he describes Elizabeth's taste shows that his own was the same; and the style which both admired was the Isocratic. Ascham, it is plain, had a true appreciation of Isocrates' merits, stressing his 'suavity,' his restraint and skill in the use of schemes, his correctness and perspicuity, rather than the qualities he shares with euphuism. It is not the schemes as such, but the moderation and taste with which they are used, which he approves. Ascham fully sympathises with the Isocratic ideal in style, and in him, as in Elyot, we may with confidence expect an intelligent imitation of their master.

One of the most important of all books for the student of sixteenth-century style is Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*, and in the present case it is particularly useful. He has only one mention of Isocrates:

> Egall members are such, when the one halfe of the sentence answereth to the other, with iust proportion of number, not that the Sillables of necessitie should bee of iust number, but that the eare might iudge them to be so egall, that there may appeare small difference....Isocrates passeth in this behalfe, who is thought to write altogether in nomber, keeping iust proportion in framing of his sentence[1].

The figure which Wilson calls 'egall members' is isocolon; and significantly it is the only scheme which he associates with Isocrates. The latter's rhythm, not his Gorgianic figures, struck Wilson; indeed, in this he is avowedly only reflecting the general sentiment of his time, for Isocrates' high position and renown were due to his finer qualities as a prose-writer. On the other hand, when Wilson comes to discuss the euphuistic figures, he draws his illustrations from popular literature and from sermons, showing that these tricks of style were common, not to say vulgar, property in his day. Wilson, then, shows himself unconscious of all but Isocrates' true merit, his rhythm.

Gabriel Harvey, writing at the end of the century, gives a useful summary of the whole matter. In his *Four Letters* of 1592, he writes, attacking Nashe: 'The world is full inough of fooleries: though the humor be not feasted with such luxurious, and riotous Pamphlets. Howe unlike Tullies sweete Offices: or Isocrates pithy instructions: or Plutarches holesome Morrals[2].'

Again, in *Pierce's Supererogation*, 1593, occur the following two passages: '...and as for a fine, or neat period, in the dainty and pithy Veyne of Isocrates, or Xenophon, marry that were a periwig of a Siren, or a wing of the very bird of Arabia, an inestimable relique. Tush

[1] Wilson, *l.c.*, p. 204.
[2] Harvey, Gabriel, *Works*, ed. A. B. Grosart (Huth Library), 1884; vol. I, p. 191.

a point, neither curious Hermogenes, nor trim Isocrates, nor stately Demosthenes, are for his [Nashe's] tooth....It is for Cheeke, or Ascham, to stand leuelling of Colons, or squaring of Periods, by measure, and number[1].' And: 'The finest wittes preferre the loosest period in M. Ascham, or Sir Philip Sidney, before the tricksiest page in Euphues, or Pap-hatchet[2].'

Again in the *New Letter of Notable Contents*, 1593, we find: 'Sir John Cheekes stile was the hony-bee of Plato: and M. Aschams Period the Syren of Isocrates[3].'

Now of course Harvey always writes as a scholar; his literary judgements are much better considered than those of the hack-pamphleteer; and after all allowances have been made for his excitement and his prejudices, there is still much significance in his utterances. Yet the contrast he draws between the 'fooleries' of the euphuists and the trim periodicity of Ascham and Isocrates is express and uncompromising. He evidently feels that they belong to opposed schools of English style, that euphuism is outside the classical tradition and allied to popular literature, and if we may judge from the casualness of his remarks, it did not occur to him that his readers might differ from him on this point. Surely this indicates that in the general opinion of the sixteenth century Isocrates stood not at all for euphuistic figures, but for smoothness, periodicity, and grace. I would not be thought to mean that Lyly and Nashe had anything in common, as Harvey may seem to imply, for of course they had not; but this does not detract from the significance of Harvey's above remarks.

The foregoing extracts show, I think, quite clearly what in Isocrates' style impressed the men of the sixteenth century. He is praised for rhythm, structure, measure, number, for fine precise neat periods; he is called 'dainty' and 'trim,' terms which then denoted courtly elegance and distinction. That is, they were impressed by his finer qualities, by the qualities which make him a really eminent stylist. On the other hand, they show themselves strangely blind to those more obvious figures of sound which strike the modern reader so immediately. Wilson speaks of his use of isocolon, not a Gorgian figure, and mentions him in no other connexion. Ascham refers to antithesis as if he associated it with Isocrates, but antithesis, unless combined

[1] Harvey, *ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 277–8. [2] *Ibid.*, II, p. 218.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, p. 266. I may add here two references which have been kindly brought to my notice. Harvey writes: 'Meissimo Isocrate, Attica Sirene' (printed in *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, 1913), p. 124: and he characterizes 'Ascamus, Rogerus,' as 'Noster Isocrates,' *ibid.*, p. 127.

with parison or paromoion, is practically universal. In the critical opinion of the sixteenth century the style of Isocrates is the very opposite of the style of *Euphues*, and they base their admiration of him on this very fact.

But is not this the exact contrary of what Norden and Feuillerat would have led us to expect? If Isocrates had been, as they say, the primogenitor of euphuism, ought not his critics and especially his imitators to have hailed with delight those things, small as they are, which he has in common with euphuism, and ought they not to have shown themselves unconscious of the other and better qualities of his style? Yet this is precisely what they do not do.

The reason why the sixteenth century was impressed with certain qualities in him and overlooked others is not far to seek. They were struck with Isocrates' grace and polish because they lacked those qualities and desired them above all others. They were unconscious of his schemes because they, unlike us to-day, were thoroughly accustomed to all the figures of formal rhetoric; they heard them from the pulpit; they learned them in school; the pamphlets that came from the popular press were full of them.

Any one who attempts to deal with the history of euphuism must take as broad an historical view as possible; he must not limit his vision to the details in the foreground of his study. When one singles out, say, Isocrates, Ascham, and Lyly, and treats them as if they had existed in a vacuum, one perceives some traits in common. But if on the other hand one regards them against the background of the general practice of their day, one perceives that these common traits were the general possession of the age; if one looks upon these men, not as isolated phenomena and with the preconceptions of the twentieth century, but from the point of view of the sixteenth century, with its preconceptions, one sees Ascham and Lyly, as Harvey did, belonging to two opposed schools of English style. To sketch in the outlines of this needed background will now be my endeavour.

(To be concluded.)

T. K. WHIPPLE.

PRINCETON, N.J., U.S.A.

SAMUEL DANIEL:

Additions to the Text.

In the course of recent work on Samuel Daniel, author of *Delia*, I have been fortunate in making a few discoveries of fresh material in prose and verse which are perhaps worthy of mention.

Up to the present there is no complete reprint of Daniel's Works. Editions since his own day have all been more or less copious Selections. The most complete and only critical edition hitherto is that of Grosart, 5 vols. 1885, but by far the most compendious, readable and attractive is still the anonymous edition of 1718, 2 vols. 12mo. Of inferior value are the reprints in Anderson's *Poets*, 1793, and Chalmers', 1810. The basis of all these texts (and there is no reason to dispute the wisdom of the choice) is 'The Whole Workes Of Samuel Daniel Esquire *in Poetrie*,' 1623, quarto (British Museum: 643.e.26).

I. It is surprising that no editor should reproduce a piece which occurs in both the perfect copies of the 1623 quarto in the British Museum, and in the Bodleian copy. On Sig. N1 of the second set of signatures is '*A Letter written to a worthy* Countesse.' It is an epistle in the vein of the well-known stanzas to Margaret—sober and dignified consolation and exhortation, in Daniel's most characteristic prose. The 'worthy Countesse' is almost certainly Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery, Daniel's former pupil, as her mother, Margaret Countess of Cumberland, died in 1616. The subject of consolation is the same as that of the stanzas to Margaret, i.e., the lengthy family law-suit which the much-wronged Margaret maintained on behalf of her daughter, and which continued after her death; and the bitter matrimonial infelicity which Anne long endured, so that she says in her autobiography (MS. Harl. 6177) that in both her husbands' lifetimes 'the Marble Pillars of Knowle in Kent, and Wilton in Wiltshire, were to me oftentimes but the gay arbour of Anguish.' But the terms of the Letter are entirely abstract:

Madame:

I Know the worthy comforts you haue giuen to many in their afflictions, make many now in yours, to returne those thankfull offices of consolation, as befits your sadnesse; and I know your owne vnderstanding heart, hauing so long conuers'd with those diuine comforts of the euerlasting Word, knowes what can be sayd to sorrow, and the miseries of this life: Yet let me tell you something out of the discourses of those ancient secretaries of nature (who no doubt had some thing of grace, or might be, as vncertaine ecchoes of that eternall voyce of truth) to shew you what they applied, out of the vnderstanding of man to such wounds of affliction, as are yours. * * *

They esteemed all aduersities to be but exercises; and they say what man of honour desires not imployment and labour, euen to the hazard of himselfe to do worthily. Virtue languishes that hath not an enemy. It then appeares what it is, and how much it weighes when by patience it shewes her patience. Fathers, say they, treat their children in another fashion, then do mothers, they command them to study to labour to exercise, they will not indure them to be idle, no not on festiue[1], they expose them to the sun, and to the dust: but mothers retaine them in the shadow, cocker them by the fire, will not haue them grieued with any labour. God is a Father to good men, loues them more masculinely. He torments them with sorrowes, losses, and afflictions, to the end to strengthen, and exercise their forces.

They say that fat-fed bodies, thorow an idle weakenesse, faint vnder the burthen of their owne waite; and that felicity that had neuer any blow can neuer indure a shocke, the more torment the more honour. Valour and worth are not knowne but by aduersity. We discerne not his constancy against reproach, contempt, and infamy, who euer liues applauded of all, and attended with a perpetuall soothing, his calamity must be the occasion to shew his vertue. * * *

To thou[2] that aske why God afflicts the best men with losses, sicknesse, and all incommodities, they say: why do they in a campe imploy the most couragious and valiant men in actions of the most hazard? Why doth the Generall send his choysest souldiers to giue a Camesado to the enemy, to discouer, and to surprize an aduantage, and yet none of them say, my Generall hath done me wrong, but rather esteemes it a great honour vnto them. The like ought they say, who by the pleasure of God, endure those miseries, for which the coward and the effeminate weepe. We are happy that we haue seem'd worthy that God would try in vs how much humaine nature could suffer. Is it not better to indure a continuall vnhappinesse that keepes man in their senses then to be perpetually dry-drunke, with prosperity, and be neuer in their right witts? * * *

To be continually in danger makes men not to account of danger. There is no tree so strong and solide, but that which the wind ordinarily beates, and those continual stormes makes him take surer roote.

These and infinite other such receits Madam did they minister vnto aduersity to keepe the heart of sorrow from being shaken with those afflictions that now assault you, and wherof you haue had so great a part in this life, as it seemes God hath set you as a marke of tryall, that you may be numbred amongst the examples of patience and substancy to other ages; and that it may be hereafter your felicity to haue had so little to do with felicity.

It was such writing as this that made Hartley Coleridge speak of Daniel as

> gentle, bland, and good,
> The wisest monitor of womanhood.

[1] 'days' omitted? Original (Seneca, *De Providentia*) is 'feriatis quoque diebus.' Much of the Letter is translated from the *De Providentia*.

[2] Read 'those.'

II. The British Museum has an interesting imperfect copy (644.a.41) of 'Certaine Small Workes *Heretofore* Diuulged by *Samuel Daniel* one of the Groomes of the *Queenes Maiesties priuie Chamber*, & now againe by him *corrected and augmented*,' 1607, octavo. The register of the perfect copy (C.34.a.46) runs ¶⁸. B—V⁸. That of the imperfect copy is as follows: ¶1 and ¶2 wanting. (¶5).(¶6).¶3.(¶4).(¶7).(¶8). 7 extra leaves, seemingly from some edition of Daniel's works not known. B—M⁸. N1. N2. N3. N4 and N5 wanting. (N6). (N7). (N8). O⁸. P¹.

Of the seven extra leaves the first four are consecutive, (A1) to (A4). The others have no signatures. On the recto of the seventh leaf is a Sonnet in italics, headed '*To the right noble Lady Anne* Lady Clifford.' The verso is blank. This Sonnet appears nowhere else among Daniel's works, and has never been reprinted. Style and subject-matter would both assign the authorship to Daniel:

I cannot giue vnto your worthines
Faire hopefull Lady these my legacies
Bequeath'd to others, who must needs possesse
The part belonging to their dignities.
Nor may I euer change their properties
I ow'd them to their worth, and they shall still
Retaine the same, although I here desire[1]
To make you suprauisor of my will
And do intreat your goodnesse to fulfill
My last desires left vnto you in trust
I know you loue the Muses, and you will
Be a most faithfull Guardian and a iust.
And therefore I do so leaue all to you
That they may both haue theirs & you your due.

III. 'Certaine Small Workes *Heretofore Di*vulged by *Samuel Daniell* one of the Groomes of the Queenes *Maiesties most Honourable pri*uie Chamber, and now *againe by him corrected and augmented*,' 1611, duodecimo (B. M.: C.34.a.1) has, Sig. (I8), a Dedicatory Epistle before *Musophilus* which has not been noticed by any editor. It is headed 'To The Right worthy Knight Sir Foulke Griuell.' It throws considerable light on the inspiration which Daniel received from Greville. It is long to quote here; but the following, in the same connection and on a similar theme, may be quoted.

IV. The last line of *Musophilus* in Grosart's edition is

Out of my better leasure, my reply.

But in 'The Poeticall *Essayes* Of Sam. Danyel. Newly corrected and augmented,' 1599, quarto (B. M.: C.59.g.26), are found (Sig. F 3 of

[1] Read 'deuise,' for the rhyme?

the second set of signatures) the following additional lines, which have not been mentioned by Grosart or any other editor:

> And if herein the curious sort shall deeme
> My will was caried far beyond my force,
> And that it is a thing doth ill beseeme
> The function of a *Poem*, to discourse:
> Thy learned iudgement which I most esteeme
> (Worthy *Fulke Greuil*) must defend this course.
> By whose mild grace, and gentle hand at first
> My Infant Muse was brought in open sight
> From out the darkenesse wherein it was nurst,
> And made to be partaker of the light;
> Which peraduenture neuer else had durst
> T' appeare in place, but had beene smothered quite.
> And now herein incourag'd by thy praise,
> Is made so bold and ventrous to attempt
> Beyond example, and to trie those waies,
> That malice from our forces thinkes exempt:
> To see if we our wronged lines could raise
> Aboue the reach of lightnesse and contempt.

V. British Museum Addit. MS. 15,214 is entitled '*Giardino di recreatione*, nel quale crescono fronde, fiori, e frutti, vaghe, leggiadri, & soavi; sotto nome di auree sentenze, belli prouerbij, et piaceuoli riboboli, tutti Italiani, colte, scelti, e scritti, per *Giovanni Florio*, non solo utili, ma diletteuoli per ogni spirito vago della Nobil lingua Italiana.' The Dedicatory Epistle is dated '*D'ossonia* à di 12 di Nouembre *1582*.' This MS. was in the possession of (1) Katherine Philips, (2) Phineas Fowke, M.D., (3) William Oldys, (4) Isaac Heard, (5) B. H. Bright. It contains autographs of 'Katharine Philipps,' Heard, Fowke, Joseph Hunter, and an unsigned note by Oldys. Amongst the commendatory verses prefixed to the text occurs a Latin quatrain headed 'In prouerbia Italica *Johannis Flori* Tetrastichon *Samuelis Danielis*.' The quatrain is:

> Italicos poterit flores cum nectere Florus,
> Nomine Florus, erit re quoqu; Florilegus,
> Floribus ex istis (mirum) nasutus odores
> Non capit, at naso qui caret, ille capit.

These verses are three years earlier than anything else we possess of Daniel's, and they bear witness to a friendship between Daniel and Florio (which was indeed highly probable, since both were at Oxford in 1582) very much earlier than was before known. This fact has direct bearing on a vexed point in the poet's biography. When the *Giardino di Ricreatione* was printed in 1591 all the commendatory verses were omitted.

VI. 'The French *Garden: for English Ladyes and* Gentlewomen to walke in. Or, A Sommer dayes labour. Being an instruction for the attayning vnto the knowledge of the French Tongue,' etc., 'By *Peter Erondell* Professor of the same Language,' 1605, octavo (Bodl. Mal. 396), contains among the commendatory verses prefixed, on Sig. (A 6), four stanzas headed '*In commendation of Mounsieur* Erondel, and his Garden.,' and signed '*S. D.*,' a not infrequent signature with Daniel. The style is Daniel's, and the poem, which has never been reprinted, is ascribed to Daniel by Ritson, Hunter and Fleay (who calls Erondel 'Evondale').

VII. In 'Songs For The Lute Viol and Voice: Composed by I. Danyel, *Batchelar in Musicke.* 1606,' folio (B. M.: K. 2. g. 9), will be found on Sigg. B 2, v. and D 2, v. fresh versions of two Delia sonnets (57 and 23 in Grosart). The first has not been reprinted:

Like as the Lute delights or else dislikes,
As is his art that playes vpon the same:
So sounds my Muse according as shee strikes
On my hart strings, high tun'd vnto her fame.
Her touch doth cause the warble of the sound,
Which here I yeeld in lamentable wise:
A wayling descant on the sweetest ground,
Whose due reports giues honour to her eyes.
If any pleasing relish here I vse,
Then Iudge the world her beautie giues the same:
Else harsh my stile vntunable my Muse,
Hoarse sounds the voice that praiseth not her name.
For no ground else could make the Musicke such,
Nor other hand could giue so sweet a touch.

Here, besides minor differences of reading, it is noticeable that ll. 9, 10 are ll. 11, 12 in Grosart, and *vice versa.*

The other Sonnet is reprinted in Bullen's *More Lyrics from the Song-Books of the Elizabethan Age,* 1888, and in *Lyrics from the Song-Books of the Elizabethan Age,* new and revised edition, 1889, but in neither case is the fact that it is a Delia Sonnet mentioned. Besides minor differences, the Song-book version has two extra lines, and the last half of the Sonnet is entirely new.

'I. Danyel' is John Daniel, the poet's brother. The style of other poems in this book suggests Samuel Daniel's authorship.

H. Sellers.

Oxford.

'PRÉCIOSITÉ' AFTER 'LES PRÉCIEUSES RIDICULES.'

I.

'Molière,' says M. Bourciez, 'dealt a serious blow to *préciosité* in *Les Précieuses ridicules*, but he did not effect its downfall. Its spirit survived and its tradition continued without interruption throughout the whole century[1].' The latter part of this statement, at any rate, is perfectly true. Molière's attack on the more conspicuous manifestations of the *esprit précieux*—the exaggerated refinement, the misplaced prudery, the romantic sentimentality, the cult of Mlle de Scudéry's novels, and, above all, the affected language—may have done something to diminish their absurdity. But the spirit itself survived, and one of its chief characteristics was the perpetual striving after *esprit*. Now this had been an important feature of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, but there was this difference between Mme de Rambouillet's famous salon and that, for instance, of Mlle de Scudéry; that while in the one *esprit* was a more or less natural growth, the current coin of a society of well-bred and intelligent men and women, in the other it was largely the fruit of laborious cultivation. The *bourgeois* men of letters and the *précieuses* who frequented Mlle de Scudéry's Saturdays were the pedants of *esprit* as well as the 'Jansenists of love.' We want no clearer proof of this than the fact that Conrart and Pellisson, Mlle de Scudéry's two chief lieutenants, kept a written record of the proceedings. The *Chronique du Samedi*, consisting of the letters and the pieces of verse and prose that were read at the meetings, forms a more or less complete history of the doings of Sapho and her friends[2].

[1] *Hist. de la Langue et de la Littérature française*, IV, p. 133. Brunetière had practically said the same thing in *La société précieuse au XVII^e siècle* (*Études critiques*, II, pp. 1 ff.).

[2] The manuscript, of which the greater part is in Conrart's handwriting, but with corrections and additions by Pellisson, has never been published *in extenso*. Extracts are printed by L. Belmont in the *Rev. d'hist. littéraire*, IX (1902), pp. 646 ff.

In 1658 the Saturdays began to languish, and in the following year, the year of *Les Précieuses ridicules*, they ceased altogether. But Mlle de Scudéry still continued to see her friends in the Rue Vieille du Temple[1]. Among these were two ladies who, like herself, remained constant to the single state, Mlle de La Vigne and Mlle Dupré. Anne de La Vigne[2] in the year 1660 was a young woman of twenty-six, good-looking and intelligent, and for all her serious studies fond of laughter. She knew Latin, was an enthusiastic Cartesian, and wrote after the fashion of the day occasional pieces of prose and light verse. From 1665 to 1668 she carried on a 'gallant' correspondence of the approved type with Conrart. The gentleman—in spite of sixty-five years and the gout—was ardent, and the lady was cruel. It was an idle game, but it was played with considerable skill on both sides. In spite of her learning Mlle de La Vigne did not aspire to be a *femme savante*. In answer to a poem, in which the shade of Descartes is represented as urging her to write an account of his philosophy, she replied in another poem, some lines of which are happily imitated from Molière's comedy :

> Je sais que la plus belle et plus forte éloquence
> Bien souvent ne vaut pas un modeste silence ;
> Que pour nous la coutume a fait presqu'un devoir
> De parler rarement et de ne rien savoir ;
> Et que si quelque dame a pris d'autres maximes
> Elle les doit cacher comme on cache les crimes[3].

Her friend Marie Dupré had an even higher reputation for learning. A niece of the Abbé Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin and of Roland Desmarets, she had, under the latter's careful tuition, studied Latin, Greek, and philosophy, and when he died in 1653, she was already known as a *femme savante*. Later she acquired the honourable *soubriquet* of 'La Cartésienne.' She was on terms of close intimacy with Conrart, and in the summer of 1669, having made the acquaintance of Bussy-Rabutin at the baths of Alise-Sainte-Reine in Burgundy[4], she established literary relations between her friend and the illustrious exile. She herself corresponded with Bussy during the next four years, interchanging with him *bouts-rimés* and other kinds of occasional verse.

[1] It was not till 1675 that she moved to the Rue de Beauce in the same quarter.

[2] 1634–1684. See A. Fabre (l'Abbé) *La jeunesse de Fléchier*, 2 vols. 1882, II, pp. 25–113; Vigneul de Marville, *Mélanges d'hist. et de litt.*, 4th ed., 1725, pp. 97–98; and for her verse, F. Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils collectifs de Poésies publiées de* 1597–1700, 3 vols., 1901–05, III, pp. 391–2.

[3] *Recueil de vers choisies* par le R. P. Bouhours, 1693, p. 31. For the poem addressed to Mlle de La Vigne see *ib.*, pp. 27–30. It is often attributed to Mlle Descartes but a contemporary authority assigns it to Pierre de La Broue, Bishop of Mirepoix (see Lachèvre, *loc. cit.*).

[4] The site of the ancient Alesia. Bussy's château is in the neighbourhood. Released from the Bastille in 1666 he had been ordered 'to take the air' on his estates.

Her personal attractions seem to have been inferior to those of her friend Mlle de La Vigne, for Somaize, who is never sparing with his compliments, can only say of her that 'he is sure that she is pretty rather than ugly[1].' She professed to despise love[2], and the words of Henriette to Armande in *Les Femmes savantes* might have been addressed to her:

> Votre esprit à l'hymen renonce pour toujours,
> Et la philosophie a toutes vos amours[3].

There is nothing to lead one to suppose that she resembled Armande in any other respect, but it would be curious if Molière, having borrowed the character of Bélise from the uncle's play of *Les Visionnaires*, should have been indebted to the niece for the suggestion of that of Armande[4].

It was natural that these two fair Cartesians should be on terms of intimacy with Catherine Descartes, the philosopher's niece, whose father was a councillor of the Breton *Parlement*. She was a friend of Mme de Sévigné and Mme de Grignan, another ardent Cartesian. 'J'aime passionnément Mlle Descartes; elle vous adore,' writes the mother to the daughter in 1689, and she sends her a *manière d'impromptu* which the lady had composed. For Mlle Descartes, like her friends, was addicted to writing verse. In the *Recueil* of le Père Bonhours will be found an interesting account from her pen, partly in verse and partly in prose, of her uncle's death[5], and Rathery and Boutron print in their life of Mlle de Scudéry six letters interspersed with verse which passed between Mlle Descartes and Sapho on the inexhaustible subject of love—as they understood it. The tone of exaggerated compliment and the slightly stilted style make them extremely characteristic of the *préciosité* of the period[6].

[1] *Dict. des Précieuses:* Diophanire, *seconde du nom.*

[2] 'L'amour est bien aveugle; n'ai-je pas raison de le mépriser? Ce qui m'aide encore à me sauver de ses pattes, c'est l'exemple de tous ceux et celles à qui il fait faire tant de sottises. A sa place, j'ai rempli mon cœur d'amitié.' (Letter to Bussy of June 22, 1671.)

[3] *Les Femmes savantes* (1672), I, i.

[4] For Mlle Dupré see Fabre, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 252–270; II, pp. 1–24; Moreri, *Dict. historique*; L'Abbé Lambert, *Hist. litt. du règne du Louis XIV*, 3 vols., 1751, III, p. 11; Lachèvre, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 324–5. Moreri and the Abbé Lambert say that she was born about the middle of the seventeenth century, but as she was already known as a *femme savante* in 1653, she must have been considerably older than this. Probably she was a year or two senior to Mlle de La Vigne, who was born in 1634.

[5] *Recueil*, pp. 129–139. The account was written in 1690.

[6] Rathery and Boutron, *Mlle de Scudéry, sa vie et sa correspondance avec un choix de ses poésies*, 1873, pp. 393–403. The letters are taken from a collection (*Essais de lettres familières*) made by the Abbé Cassagne and first printed in 1690. They are not dated, but were written after 1654, probably about 1660. Mlle Descartes was born in 1637 and died in 1706. A 'portrait' of her by her own hand is printed in *La Galerie des Portraits de Mlle de Montpensier*, ed. É. de Barthélemy, 1860, pp. 549 ff.

Much of the verse—*bouts-rimés, chansons,* madrigals, epigrams, enigmas, sonnets, epistles, portraits, *placets*—with which Mlle de Scudéry and her friends amused themselves was printed in the *Recueils* which were so popular at this time. Their greatest vogue was from 1652 to 1668, after which the production began to slacken and from 1673 to 1690 no *Recueil* of any note appeared. The earliest collection to achieve popularity was the *Recueil de diverses poésies,* published by Chamboudry in 1652, followed by a second part in the same year. By 1657 it had reached a ninth edition, but even with successive augmentations it was never more than a thin volume[1]. It was surpassed in popularity and very greatly in size by the *Poésies choisies de Mm. Corneille, Benserade, &c.,* which the well-known bookseller, Charles de Sercy, brought out in 1653, and which, ultimately increased to five parts, found numerous readers down to 1666[2]. 'Nous avons une amie particulière qui nous a promis d'amener ici tous ces Messieurs du *Recueil des pièces choisies,*' says one of the *précieuses* in Molière's farce. Another collection, which had a longer life, was that known as La Suze-Pellisson, which first appeared in 1663[3] as a single volume, containing three pieces by Mlle de Scudéry, one by the Comtesse de La Suze[4], one by Pellisson and seventeen by various writers. Reprinted with additions in 1666 and 1668, it was expanded in 1674 into four volumes in which form it frequently re-appeared down to 1725[5]. This fashion of publishing collections of occasional verse is laughed at by Furetière in *Le roman bourgeois* (1666):

A propos (reprit Hippolyte) ne trouvez-vous pas que ces recueils fournissent une occasion de se faire connoistre bien facilement et à peu de frais ? Je vois beaucoup d'autheurs qui n'ont esté connus que par là.... Ce n'est pas tout (adjousta Charroselles) que de faire de petites pièces ; il faut, pour les faire bien courir, que ce soient pièces du temps, c'est-à-dire à la mode, de sorte que ce sont tantost

[1] Lachèvre, II, pp. 33 ff.

[2] *Ib.*, II, pp. 52 ff.

[3] *Recueil de Pièces galantes en prose et en vers des plus beaux esprits du temps.* Dedié à Mme la Comtesse de la Suze, 1663. See Lachèvre, III, pp. 41 ff.

[4] Henriette de Coligny (1618–1673) married first Thomas Hamilton, Earl of Haddington, and secondly the Comte de La Suze, from whom she obtained a judicial separation in 1661. She had a salon and was celebrated as a poetess. A volume of her verses (*Poésies*) was published in 1666. In Titon du Tillet's monument representing *le Parnasse français* she figures as one of the three Graces with Mlle de Scudéry and Mme Deshoulières. In Somaize's dictionary she appears as Doralise, 'une pretieuse de qualité qui a autant fait parler d'elle que pas une femme de royaume,' for if she was a *précieuse* she was very much more of a *femme galante.* The notice concludes with the remark that 'sa ruelle est toujours une des plus considérables de l'empire des pretieuses.' For her poems see Lachèvre, II, pp. 227–9; see also E. Magne, *Mme de la Suze et la Société Précieuse,* 1908.

[5] An edition was published at Trévoux in this year. The most complete edition is that of 1674, which contains 349 pieces.

sonnets, rondeaux, portraits, enigmes, metamorphoses, tantost triolets, ballades, chansons, et jusqu'à des bouts rimez. Encore, pour les faire courir plus viste, il faut choisir le sujet, et que ce soit sur la mort d'un petit chien ou d'un perroquet, ou de quelques grands aventures arrivées dans le monde galant et poétique. Quand à moi (reprit Hippolyte), j'ayme sur tout les bouts-rimez, parce que ce sont le plus souvent des impromptus, ce que j'estime la plus certaine marque de l'esprit d'un homme. Vous n'estes pas seule de vostre advis (dit Angélique); j'ay veu plusieurs femmes tellement infatuées de cette sorte de galanterie d'impromptu, qu'elles les preferoient aux ouvrages les plus accomplis et aux plus belles méditations[1].

Of the interlocutors in this dialogue, Charroselles stands for Charles Sorel, against whom Furetière bore a particular grudge; Hippolyte is the 'name in romance' of a *bourgeoise* named Phylippote, who affected with insupportable pedantry to be a *femme savante*; while Angélique, the hostess of the salon where the conversation takes place, is Angélique Petit, who figures in Somaize's dictionary as Panthée, and is there described as a good linguist and mathematician. There is a portrait of her in verse by Lignières in Mlle de Montpensier's *Recueil des portraits*[2], which corresponds fairly well with Furetière's account of her. He describes her 'as a person of great merit, who had learnt several languages and read all sorts of good literature, but she concealed her knowledge as if it were a crime....' 'Every day a distinguished company met in her salon. Sometimes they discussed curious questions; at other times the topic was love ('on faisait des conversations galantes'); in fact they endeavoured to imitate everything that goes on in the best salons ('les belles ruelles') among *précieuses* of the first rank.'

This picture of a second-rate Paris salon in the sixties of the seventeenth century is no doubt a faithful one. For Furetière, who was an excellent observer, but a poor artist, was incapable of that exaggeration for comic purposes which is so effective in Molière's comedy, or rather, farce of *Les Précieuses ridicules*. Moreover, while Molière's play is professedly a satire on *deux pecques provinciales* newly arrived in Paris, Furetière represents a salon presided over by a lady 'of great merit,' learned and well read, who was opposed to the views of the majority of her guests. These include, besides the author, Charroselles, and the *précieuse* Hippolyte, two well-bred gentlemen named Philalethe and Pancrace, who do not share the enthusiasm of the others for the fashionable verse-making of the day. But Pancrace, at

[1] A volume of these 'questions' for the use of society was compiled in 1671 under the title, *Questions d'amour ou conversations galantes*. (See T. F. Crane, *Les Héros de Roman*, 1902, p. 123.)

[2] First printed in 1659, and reprinted in 1663. When the fashion of 'portraits' descended to the *bourgeoisie* it was abandoned by the aristocracy.

any rate, is a reader of the fashionable romances, and he lends the five volumes of *L'Astrée* to the little *bourgeoise* Javotte, who is ashamed at her ignorance, to enable her to become as learned as the other ladies. 'Je voudrois bien avoir le secret de ces demoiselles, qui causent si bien.'

It should be noticed that the only one of the company in whose language there is any trace of *préciosité* is Charroselles. Here again Furetière is true to nature. Apart from the *langage de galanterie*, there is very little that can be called *précieux* in the style either of Mlle de Scudéry's novels or of her letters. In dealing with ordinary topics true *précieuses* used the *style figuré* with discrimination[1]. The inferior *précieuses* naturally improved on their models. Exaggerate their absurdities by means of accumulation, repetition, and the other methods of a master of the comic art, and the result is the immortal jargon of *Les Précieuses ridicules*[2]. But in the language of gallantry the *style figuré* which Alceste so much detested continued to flourish, and we have an admirable parody of it from the pen of Mme de La Fayette:

> Vous pouvez croire que cette manière de peindre m'a tiré de grands rideaux. Il est vrai que vous avez peut-être oublié qu'il y a des choses dont je ne tâte jamais, et que je suis une espèce d'homme que l'on ne tourne pas aisément sur un certain pied. Sûrement ce n'est pas mon caractère que d'être dupe et de donner tête baissée dans le panneau. Je me le tiens pour dit : j'entends le françois, à la vérité ; je ne ferai point de fracas, j'en userai honnêtement ; je n'afficherai point, je ne donnerai rien au public ; je retirerai mes troupes, mais comptez que vous n'avez pas obligé un ingrat[3].

Another feature which appears in Furetière's picture of Angélique's salon and which is still more apparent in that of Mlle de Scudéry is the growing importance attached by women to learning. If *Les Précieuses ridicules* is a farce, *Les Femmes savantes* is a true comedy. If the earlier play represents the *préciosité* of 1659 in its more ridiculous aspects, the later play is a more or less faithful picture of the *préciosité* of 1672 as exhibited in a well-to-do *bourgeois* family.

In the same quarter of Paris as the Rue Vieille du Temple, Mme de Caumartin and Mme Deshoulières, the former in her fine hôtel in the Rue Sainte-Avoye, the latter in her more humble abode in the Rue de l'Homme Armé, presided over salons which were frequented by the same guests as that of Mlle de Scudéry. Mme de Caumartin

[1] The language of Climène in *La Critique de l'École des Femmes* (1663) may be taken as a fair satire on that of the better sort of Parisian *précieuse*.

[2] See E. Roy, *La vie et les œuvres de Charles Sorel*, 1891, c. x, for an excellent and highly suggestive study of the language of *Les Précieuses ridicules*.

[3] *Corr. de Bussy-Rabutin*, I, p. 466.

was the second wife of Louis-François de Caumartin, a Master of Requests, who was the devoted friend of Cardinal de Retz. In 1664, ten years after the death of his first wife, he married Catherine de Verthamon, sister of Mme de Sévigné's friend and correspondent, Mme de Guitaut. Twenty-two years of age, good looking, intelligent, well educated, free from pedantry, but fond of the society of men of letters, she had all the qualities of a good hostess. Her husband, a man of high character, fully shared her love of letters and brilliant conversation. Moreover the grave magistrate was in his leisure hours a *bel-esprit*, and a warm partisan of the literary school which flourished in his youth—he was born in 1624—and which was represented in his wife's salon by Chapelain, Conrart, and Pellisson[1].

If Mme de Caumartin made no pretensions to be either a *précieuse* or a *femme savante*, Mme Deshoulières was both. In her own day she was called the Tenth Muse, and though her fame as a poetess has greatly diminished, she still retains a modest place in histories of French literature. Her best poetry, the *Reflexions morales*, was mostly written during the last twelve years of her life (1682–1694), when she was suffering from mortal disease. The idylls, as she calls them, of her earlier days breathe the atmosphere, not of the country, but of the salon, and like her friends she was too much addicted to writing verse on the most trivial subjects. But it is with her salon and not with her poetry that we are now concerned. Born in 1638, Antoinette Du Ligier de La Garde was married at the age of thirteen to an officer in high favour with Condé, who followed the fortunes of that illustrious rebel when he entered the service of Spain. Restored to her parents, the young wife spent the next two or three years in quiet study at Paris, and it was not till after the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659), followed by some years of privation and adventure, that having separated from her husband—owing, we are told, to money difficulties —she set up her salon in the Rue de l'Homme Armé[2].

Though the salons of Mlle de Scudéry and Mme Deshoulières were frequented by more or less the same guests, there was this difference between them, that while Mlle de Scudéry was a peacemaker and loved to compose quarrels, Mme Deshoulières was a strong partisan, and her salon became the headquarters of the opposition to Boileau and his

[1] For M. and Mme Caumartin, see Fabre, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 129–153.

[2] Probably in 1671, when her husband was sent to Bayonne and was employed for ten years in the fortifications of Guyenne (Fabre, *Correspondance de Fléchier*, p. 143 n. (2)).

friends. Boileau's attack on her in his Tenth Satire, written in 1692, is well known:

> C'est une précieuse,
> Reste de ces esprits jadis si renommés
> Que d'un coup de son art Molière a diffamés.
> De tous leurs sentiments cette noble héritière,
> Maintient encore ici leur secte façonnière:
> Là, du faux bel-esprit, se tiennent les bureaux;
> Là, tous les vers sont bons pourvu qu'ils soient nouveaux[1].

Another hostess who belonged to the same party was Mme de Scudéry, the widow of Georges de Scudéry[2], whose enmity to Boileau was due to his criticisms of her husband's writings and not to any attachment to the *précieux* school. She disclaimed both learning and *esprit*—'C'est ma belle-sœur qui est savante'—and though she was visited by Chapelain, Ménage, Cotin, and Mascaron, she also counted among her friends the Duc de Saint-Aignan[3], a writer of occasional verse and a member of the Academy, to whom Racine dedicated his first play, the Duc de Noailles, and the Père Rapin. From her correspondence with Bussy-Rabutin we gather that she was of a serious and even melancholy temperament, but her letters are marked by good sense, good feeling, and transparent candour, and they are admirably written[4]. She was a great friend of Mlle Dupré[5].

Of the older men who frequented the salons of Mlle de Scudéry and her friends, Chapelain, Conrart, and Pellisson have already been mentioned. To the same generation belonged Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin[6], the uncle of Mlle Dupré, who, if he can hardly be claimed for the *précieux* school, was a strong opponent of Boileau; Isaac de Benserade[7], that veteran of light verse, who turned the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid into *rondeaux*[8], and for twenty years was responsible for the *ballets de cour*; the Abbé Cotin[9], and Gilles Ménage, the Trissotin and

[1] *Sat.* x, ll. 437–447.

[2] 1637–1711. She was left a widow in 1667.

[3] 1607–1687; elected to the Academy in 1663. He was father of the Duc de Beauvilliers, the governor of the Duc de Bourgogne.

[4] The correspondence began in 1670 and was continued with regularity till 1680, after which it slackened considerably.

[5] 'Nous sommes inséparables; c'est la meilleure amie que j'aie au monde' (Mme de S. to Bussy, Sept. 8, 1670. *Corr. de Bussy-Rabutin*, I, p. 312).

[6] 1595–1676.

[7] 1612–1694. See *L'hist. de l'Académie française* by Pellisson and Olivet, ed. Livet, 2 vols., 1858, II, pp. 236 ff.

[8] The Abbé d'Olivet thus accounts for the complete failure of this work, whereas the author's earlier verses had been very successful: 'Quand ses Rondeaux parurent (1676), le goût avoit bien changé. Corneille, Molière, Racine, et Despréaux, par leurs ouvrages excellents, avoient fait détester le mauvais, et mépriser le médiocre. Si bien que les Rondeaux de M. de Benserade, qui trente ou quarante ans plus tôt eussent trouvé des admirateurs, ne trouvèrent pas même des lecteurs' (*op. cit.*, p. 247).

[9] 1604–1682.

Vadius of *Les Femmes savantes*. Ménage, indeed, was a man of solid learning, but he also aspired to be a *bel-esprit*, a *rôle* in which he comported himself after the manner of a playful bear. His Wednesday gatherings, or *Mercuriales*, as he called them, had considerable *éclat* and formed another centre of opposition to the 'insolent clique' of Boileau.

Of the younger generation, contemporaries of Boileau and Racine, Ménage's friend and correspondent, Pierre-Daniel Huet, may be regarded on the whole as belonging to the same school[1]. In his earlier days, before he was appointed assistant-tutor to the Dauphin or had thought of taking Orders[2], he wrote occasional verse, chiefly in Latin, but sometimes in French[3]. He was the friend and correspondent of Mlle de Scudéry for forty years and a welcome visitor in the Rue Sainte-Avoye. Another frequenter of the same salons was Charles Perrault. He is chiefly known now-a-days for his fairy tales and his agreeable memoirs, but his reputation was made as a writer of light verse, especially of a celebrated *Portrait d'Iris*[4], and he was one of the most active opponents of Boileau and his friends. Perrault's friend, Philippe Quinault[5], was also a strong partisan of the *précieux* school, and Boileau found their names, as well as those of Boursault and Hesnault, conveniently interchangeable in his verse. When he became reconciled with one, he had only to substitute the name of another, without having to rack his brains for a new rhyme[6].

Quinault represents in a special degree the influence of Mlle de Scudéry's novels on the drama. From 1656 till 1666 he produced several tragedies and tragi-comedies, which had great success and which led a contemporary dramatist to praise him as one 'qui sait parfaitement la carte de Tendre et qui touche si bien les passions amoureuses[7].' However, about this time he abandoned the regular

[1] His literary tastes are indicated with his usual insight by Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, II, pp. 163 ff., see also *Portraits Contemporains*, II, pp. 243 ff.

[2] He was appointed *sous-précepteur* to the Dauphin in 1670, took Orders in 1676, and was made Bishop of Avranches in 1685.

[3] The Abbé Fabre prints three interesting letters written to Huet by Mme de La Fayette *à propos* of his verses. In one of them she says, perhaps not without a touch of malice, 'Vous devenez poete françois; il me semble que vous devriez tenir à la muse latine; c'est trop d'être à la fois et latin et françois.' (*La Jeunesse de Fléchier*, II, pp. 347–351.)

[4] Printed in *Portraits de Mlle de Montpensier*, pp. 173 ff. For Perrault (1628–1703) see P. Bonnefon, *Charles Perrault, Essai sur sa vie et ses ouvrages* in *Rev. d'hist. litt.* 1904, pp. 365 ff.

[5] 1635–1688.

[6] In *Sat.* ix, 97, the name of Boursault was replaced first by that of Perrault and then by that of Quinault. In *Le Lutrin*, III, 48, Perrault was substituted for Boursault, and finally altered to Hesbault.

[7] Gabriel Chappuzean in *L'Europe vivante* (1667) *ap.* E. Despois, *Le théâtre français sous Louis XIV*, 1894, p. 380 n.

drama, and in 1672 he produced the first of those operas in which he so skilfully wedded his lyrical measures to the music of Lulli. Thomas Corneille's[1] supple genius lent itself to any type of drama that promised popularity, and, like Quinault, he produced romanesque tragi-comedies down to 1672. The influence of Quinault is also visible in the great Corneille's *Agesilas* (1666) and in the *Germanicus* (1679) of Edmé Boursault[2], the exaggerated praise of which by Corneille at the Académie française gave offence to Racine. His *Portrait du peintre* or *Contre-critique de l'École des femmes* brought him into collision with Molière, who amply avenged himself in *L'Impromptu de Versailles*, and he also had a quarrel with Boileau.

If *préciosité* influenced the stage in the persons of Quinault and Thomas Corneille, it was represented in the pulpit by Mascaron and Fléchier. The former was a life-long friend and admirer of Mlle de Scudéry. Writing to her in 1672, the year after he was made Bishop of Tulle, he says, 'My occupation this autumn is the reading of *Cyrus*, *Clélie*, and *Ibrahim*. These works always have for me the charm of novelty, and I find in them so much that is useful for the reformation of the world that I have no difficulty in declaring that when I am preparing my sermons for the Court you are very often by the side of St Augustine and St Bernard[3].' After this frank avowal one is not surprised to find that his first funeral oration, that for Anne of Austria (1666), abounds in points and metaphors. His brother prelate, Esprit Fléchier, is one of the most interesting examples of the *préciosité* of the period[4]. Coming to Paris in 1659 at the malleable age of seventeen, with his way to make in the world, he found a protector in Conrart, who introduced him to the circle of Mlle de Scudéry and brought him to the particular notice of the Duc de Montausier. On the latter's recommendation he entered the family of M. de Caumartin (*circ.* 1662) as tutor to his son, and accompanied him to Clermont when he went there in 1665 as a member of the royal commission of Les Grands-Jours. Fléchier's well-known account of the proceedings appeared in the following year. It contains several interesting stories and is agreeably written, but the *précieux* element reveals itself, partly in the abuse of antithesis, and partly in the perpetual

[1] 1625–1709. [2] 1638–1701.

[3] Rathery and Boutron, *op. cit.*, pp. 127–8.

[4] Besides L'Abbé Fabre's three works (*De la correspondance de Fléchier avec Mme Des Houlières et sa fille*, 1871; *La Jeunesse de Fléchier*; and *Fléchier orateur*, 2nd ed. 1886), see Saint-Beuve, *Caus. du Lundi*, xv, pp. 383 ff.; and F. Brunetière, *La société précieuse au XVII^e siècle* (on Fabre's *La Jeunesse de Fléchier*).

badinage with which he enlivens his narrative, even of the most sombre crimes[1]. He brought with him to Auvergne the reputation of a poet as well as a *bel-esprit*. The greater part of his verse, which was no better and no worse than that of the other members of his circle, was produced between 1663 and 1668, and found its way into various *Recueils*[2]. In 1668, thanks again to M. de Montausier, he was transferred to the higher sphere of the Court, being appointed reader to the Dauphin. From Versailles, where his time seems to have hung rather heavily on his hands, he carried on for two years a correspondence of the usual *précieux* type with Mlle de La Vigne. About the same time he began to frequent the salon of Mme Deshoulières, and struck up a friendship with her daughter—she shared her mother's poetical talents —which lasted till the end of his life. In 1672 he preached his first funeral oration, that on Mme de Montausier, the famous Julie, and having made his mark as an orator was elected to the Academy in the following year. His long and assiduous correspondence with Mlle Deshoulières began about the year 1677. It is conducted at first in the same tone and with the same adherence to the rules of the game as that with Mlle de La Vigne. Fléchier is perfectly conscious that he is writing for effect, and that his letters, like those of Balzac and Voiture, will be read aloud in more than one salon and passed round to the *habitués*. But he is also alive to the humorous aspect of this *commerce de galanterie*, of these amorous sighs which exist only on paper, of this holding of the fort against a mock siege[3]. 'Perhaps what I write is *galimatias*.' He realised, in fact, that he was playing a game, and he played it with skill and tact. But after he became a Bishop (1685)[4] the tone of his letters changes, and *galanterie* gives place to the sincere expression of real friendship.

In 1681 Fléchier sent Mlle Deshoulières a 'portrait' of himself drawn with his usual tact and urbanity[5]. This fashion of written 'portraits' was of all the *précieux* fashions the one which made the deepest mark on French literature, and which lasted the longest.

[1] Both these faults were due to the example of Balzac and Voiture. The Abbé Trublet says of Balzac, 'Il prodigue l'antithèse et l'hyperbole; c'est son défaut essentiel'; of Voiture, 'Son tour d'esprit le porte au badinage,' and of the two together, 'L'antithèse et même l'hyperbole sont également leurs figures favorites.' *Essais sur divers sujets de littérature et de morale*, I (1735).

[2] See Lachèvre, III, pp. 333–8.

[3] In *Les Grands-Jours d'Auvergne* he draws satirical portraits of two *précieuses languissantes* of Clermont.

[4] Bishop of Lavaur; he was transferred to Nîmes in 1687.

[5] Part of it is quoted by Sainte-Beuve (*Port. Cont.* v, pp. 108–9); see also Fabre, *Correspondance de Fléchier*, p. 243.

In the second quarter of the next century it was much in vogue in the salon of Mme Du Deffand, and she herself and her friend, the Président d'Hénault, were adepts at it. It may be said that Fléchier's funeral oration on the Duchesse de Montausier was a 'portrait' writ large. The Duke's choice of Fléchier to deliver the oration was not only natural but appropriate, for the *Guirlande de Julie* was the first outward symptom of *préciosité* that showed itself in the Hôtel de Rambouillet. Julie herself, however, suffered less from the disease than her husband, who, in spite of his *vertu hérissée* and *mœurs antiques* (Saint-Simon), had a considerable touch of it. The friend of Godeau, Conrart and Chapelain, he wrote verses in his youth, including the lion's share of the *Guirlande*, with the best of them. After the Fronde he tried, though with little success, to revive the glories of the Blue Chamber, and he was a regular attendant at Mlle de Scudéry's Saturdays[1]. It was doubtless in her salon that Conrart presented to him Fléchier and Huet—to their great advantage, for he was a loyal friend and an active patron. His loyalty to Chapelain, indeed, carried him so far as to regard *La Pucelle* as a masterpiece, and Boileau as a monster of malignity. But a flattering reference to him in the *Épître à Racine* (1677) charmed away his wrath, and after an interchange of compliments in the gallery of Versailles, followed by an invitation to dinner, the satirist found 'in the most virtuous and respectable noble of the Court'—the phrase is Boileau's—a generous friend and a severe critic[2].

Other frequenters of the *précieux* salons were the three Abbés, Jacques Cassagne[3], Jean Testu de Mauroy[4], and Paul Tallemant[5], all of whom had a reputation as writers of light verse. In fact the last-named was elected to the Academy (1666) at the age of twenty-four on the strength of his *poésies galantes*. His cousin, François Tallemant[6], brother of Tallemant des Réaux, attained to the same distinction in 1651 without having written a line. Later he earned a

[1] 'Il fait trop le métier de bel-esprit pour un homme de qualité, ou du moins, il le fait trop sérieusement. Il va au samedi fort souvent' (Tallemant Des Réaux).

[2] A. Roux, *Montausier, sa vie et son temps*, 1860, pp. 203–205. Montausier was appointed governor to the Dauphin in 1668; it was doubtless not his fault that his charge did not do more credit to him, but his methods, it must be confessed, were sometimes brutal and sometimes pedantic. He was created a *duc et pair* in 1664.

[3] 1635–1679; also of repute as a preacher; mentioned by Boileau, *Sat.* II, 60. See also Chapelain, *Mémoire de quelques Gens de Lettres vivans en* 1662, *ap.* J. E. Fidao-Justinian, *L'esprit classique et la préciosité, au xvii^e siècle*, 1914, p. 220.

[4] 1626–1706; he figures in Somaize as Tiridate II de Memnon; he was tutor to Monsieur's daughters (see D'Alembert, *Hist. des membres de l'Académie française*, 6 vols., 1785–7, II, 307 ff). His name appeared in the earlier editions of Boileau's *Satires* (VII, p. 45), but Boileau afterwards put Pradon in his place.

[5] 1642–1712.

[6] 1620–1693. See Chapelain, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

place in Boileau's *Seventh Epistle* by his translation of the Lives of Plutarch. He, too, was an Abbé and an *alcoriste*. Lastly, to complete the list, we have François Charpentier[1], who was reputed to have a profound knowledge of antiquity, and Claude Boyer[2] and Michel Le Clerc[3], both natives of Albi, and both writers of unsuccessful tragedies.

These *ruelles* of the Marais were the headquarters of *préciosité*. But there were a few others, more aristocratic in character, which were more or less imbued with the same spirit, and in which the writers of the same school found a welcome. First, there was the salon of Mlle de Montpensier in the Luxembourg, where according to her secretary, Segrais, 'tout ce qu'il y avait de beaux esprits y trouvaient leur place comme chez Mécénas[4].' Cotin was one of her *protégés*, and according to the Abbé d'Olivet the scene between him and Ménage which Molière has immortalised in *Les Femmes savantes* took place in her salon. Huet occasionally acted as her reader. She herself had written portraits and romances; in fact this romantic and sentimental princess might have stepped straight out of *Le grand Cyrus* or *Clélie*. In the words of Sainte-Beuve 'she belongs to the literature of the Regency.' Jean Regnault de Segrais[5], who was her secretary till 1671, when she dismissed him for opposing her marriage with Lauzun, was a violent partisan of the old school. A friend of Chapelain, an admirer of his *Pucelle* and of Mlle de Scudéry's 'natural and tender verse,' he deeply resented Boileau's attacks on them, and he was an ardent champion of Corneille against the upstart Racine. Unlike Montausier, he was in no wise mollified by the praise which Boileau bestowed on his eclogues in the *Art poétique*[6]. However, in 1676 he retired to his native Caen, where he married an heiress, translated Virgil, reconstituted its Academy, and became the leader of its literary society.

Marie-Anne Mancini, the youngest of Mazarin's five nieces of that name, married the Duc de Bouillon in 1662, and soon afterwards made her hôtel a social and literary centre. Her most distinguished client was La Fontaine, whose acquaintance she had made at Château-Thierry, but most of her *habitués* were drawn from the opposite faction, and included Segrais, Ménage, Boyer, and Benserade. She was also on intimate terms with Mme Deshoulières.

[1] 1620–1703. See D. Alembert, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 127 ff.
[2] 1618–1698. [3] 1622–1691.
[4] She was established there in 1657, but from 1662 to 1664 she was in exile.
[5] 1624–1701. See D'Alembert, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 73 ff.
[6] 'Que Segrais, dans l'églogue, en charme les forêts.' Segrais was at least an artist in verse, and in a more poetical age he might have been a poet.

At Paris, says Saint-Simon, 'she was a sort of queen,' and her house was open from morning to night. Like the rest of her family she had charm in abundance; she was well-read and a good talker; and she was a sure and constant friend. But she had an imperious temper and could not bear opposition[1]. Her brother, Philippe Mancini, Duc de Nevers, aspired to be a *bel-esprit*, wrote verses, and frequented the salon of Mme Deshoulières. Lastly, there were the two allied salons of the Duchesse de Richelieu and Mme d'Albret, which, according to Mme de Caylus, the beautiful and lively cousin of Mme de Maintenon[2], were a continuation and a copy of the Hôtel de Rambouillet[3]. At both Mme Scarron was an ornament, and her cousin tells us that it was on this account that Louis XIV was at first prejudiced against her, for he suspected her of being a *précieuse*. He was wrong; she had far too much good sense. It is very probable, however, that her coldness, her reserve, and her dignified bearing, which made it impossible for any man to attempt a liberty with her, led to the epithet being applied to her by Louis's courtiers. It was at the Hôtel d'Albret that she met Mme de Montespan, who was a relation of the hostess.

Madeleine Guénegaud, wife of Maréchal d'Albret was, says Mme de Caylus, 'une femme de mérite sans esprit,' who 'in spite of her piety was accused of being rather too fond of the glass[4].' She was sister-in-law to the Duchesse de Richelieu[5], whose first husband was Alexandre d'Albret, Seigneur de Pons, elder brother of the Maréchal. Left a widow, 'without money, beauty of youth, and without much *esprit*,' she succeeded in capturing the young Duke of Richelieu, much to the astonishment of the Court and greatly to the chagrin of his aunt and guardian, the Duchesse d'Aiguillon[6]. Mlle de Montpensier speaks slightingly of her—'elle avoit un air bourgeois; c'était une tracassière qui ne savait pas vivre'—but Mademoiselle's judgments are often biassed. At any rate the Duchess bore with her husband's extravagance and gambling-losses without any sign of ill-temper. They had this in common that they liked the society of wits and men of letters, and their house was frequented by more or less the same guests as the Hôtel d'Albret. There was, however, this difference, says Mme de Caylus,

[1] Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, x, pp. 195–7.

[2] She is sometimes spoken of as her niece, but she was only a niece *à la mode de Bretagne*. She was one of the most beautiful women of her time.

[3] *Souvenirs de Mme de Caylus*, ed. E. Raunié, 1889, p. 52.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 14–15. Mme de Sévigné's cousin Coulanges made an irreverent *chanson* on her.

[5] Anne Poussart Du Vigean, sister of Condé's love; their mother was a great friend of the Duchesse d'Aiguillon and a frequent visitor at the Hôtel de Rambouillet.

[6] See *Mémoires de Mme de Motteville*, III, pp. 110–115.

that at the Hôtel de Richelieu, the Abbé Testu took the lead and aspired to be its Voiture. 'He wrote indifferent verse,' adds the lady, who evidently did not like him, 'and his style was full of antithesis and points[1].' He certainly had no small share of the *précieux* spirit, and he deservedly figures in the dictionary of Somaize as 'Tiridate troisième du nom, dont l'esprit est connu de toutes celles qui tiennent alcoves.' Among his many lady friends, however, there were several who were not in the least *précieuses*, notably, Mme de Maintenon, Mme de Coulanges, who greatly added to the gaiety of the Hôtel de Richelieu—her confessor said of her that 'each of her sins is an epigram'—and Mme de Sévigné, in whose letters we hear much of the Abbé's vapours and sleeplessness[2].

Among the other frequenters of the Hôtel de Richelieu one of the most distinguished was the Cardinal d'Estrées[3], who was a member of the Academy from 1658 and lived to be its *doyen*. Though he published nothing, he was, says Saint-Simon, a man of 'rare condition,' 'un esprit supérieur' as well as a *bel-esprit*. In all Saint-Simon's gallery there is no portrait that makes a more favourable impression[4] than that of this well-bred, dignified, high-minded, entertaining, and in every way delightful churchman of the *Grand Siècle*. One of his remarks will bear repetition. One day at dinner the king, who was an enormous eater, complained of the inconvenience of having no teeth. 'Des dents, Sire,' replied the Cardinal, who old though he was had beautiful white teeth, which he showed in speaking, 'Eh! qui est-ce qui en a?'

Other *habitués* were M. de Barillon, for many years ambassador at the Court of St James; Mlle d'Aumale, who married the celebrated Maréchal Schomberg, as his second wife, in 1669, and who according to Mme de Caylus was a *précieuse*[5]; and Mlle de Pons, a relation of the Maréchal d'Albret, afterwards Mme d'Heudicourt, who was extremely pretty, very amusing, and altogether a highly original character[6]. Mme de Maintenon, who kept up her intimacy with her, declared that she never opened her mouth without making her laugh.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

[1] *Souvenirs de Mme de Caylus*, pp. 83–4.

[2] 1626–1706. He was elected to the Academy in 1665. Saint-Simon has a good portrait of him, which is much more favourable than that of Mme de Caylus. He says that he was one of the first persons to have the 'vapours.' (See *Mémoires*, III, pp. 444–5.) See also D'Alembert, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 335 ff., and for his poetry, Lachèvre, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 485–6, III, pp. 550–1.

[3] 1628–1714.

[4] *Mémoires*, X, pp. 348–355.

[5] *Souvenirs*, p. 87. According to Segrais she is one of the *précieuses* in Mlle de Montpensier's novel of *La Princesse de Paphlagonie*.

[6] *Ib.*, pp. 87, 129–132; Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, I, pp. 351–3.

SOME ENGLISH POETS IN MODERN ITALIAN LITERATURE.

'Of foreign literatures, Italy reads only the French writers of the last few years,' wrote Carducci. 'In literature she is already a department of France.' The remark sounds pessimistic, but it is a fact that modern French books are more widely circulated in the peninsula than all but those of a very few living Italian writers, and that some Italians are said to prefer to read D'Annunzio in French. In any case the claims of Paris to the intellectual leadership of the Latin world, in America almost more than in Europe, cannot be seriously contested. During the eighteenth century English writers such as Pope and Addison, Young and 'Ossian' Macpherson, and, indeed, English literature generally, was held in high repute in Italy, but at that time it was in closer touch with the main movement on the continent than it has been since. Voltaire himself had deigned to notice it and his half-contemptuous patronage of Shakespeare, as of Dante, at least drew attention to them and was thus the first step towards the recognition of their true position outside their own countries. But the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars left England more than ever isolated from the rest of Europe. Shakespeare had, indeed, by this time come into his own, and during the romantic movement there was a school of novelists who owed more to *Waverley* than to Manzoni's *Promessi Sposi*. But even then Italy looked to France or to Germany for her inspiration rather than to England.

The reason is not far to seek. Throughout the nineteenth century Italy had but one object, the expulsion of the foreigner from the peninsula, and men of letters were among the staunchest supporters of the national movement, to which literature was deliberately subordinated. There was no talk of art for art's sake. Literature was to be the 'minister of something greater and more important than itself,' said Mazzini. Italians, like most Latins, will always be Republicans at heart. The normal, healthy schoolboy of the well-to-do classes in a

Latin country is as naturally liberal as he is conservative in England. France and Spain can look back upon a glorious past as monarchies, but Italy's best traditions from Ancient Rome to the Lombard League and the great days of Venice, Florence and Genoa have all been Republican. There the king has almost always been a usurper, generally a foreign conqueror, whom the 'geographical expression,' hopelessly divided against itself, made spasmodic and generally unsuccessful efforts to overthrow. There may have been differences of opinion as to the form of Republic a liberated Italy should adopt, but a Republic it was to be and Cavour's genius alone turned the movement to the advantage of the House of Savoy. Carducci, though reconciled to the monarchy in later life, declared that he considered it a mere name, refusing to believe that 'even His Majesty King Humbert is a genuine, convinced monarchist.' To men of this stamp the French Revolution meant everything.

In England, on the other hand, the tendency was in the opposite direction. As Matthew Arnold pointed out, nineteenth-century English poetry stood apart from the main current of modern thought. The Lake poets may have cherished revolutionary dreams in their youth, but they soon fell into line with the ideals of their country and their class. Consequently the English poets who have been most popular and have had the greatest influence on their own generation, such as Wordsworth, Tennyson and Browning, men of the middle classes, have had no influence on the continent. No doubt, excellent articles on them have appeared in the *Nuova Antologia* and elsewhere, and their merits have been duly acknowledged. Translations of Tennyson have been published, and D'Annunzio gives us a prose version of *Tears, idle tears* in the *Trionfo della Morte*, while he quotes *Crossing the Bar* in his latest novel. But our modern poets are known chiefly to critics, who speak of them as of something exotic and unfamiliar, admiring them without really sympathising with them. These English poets had too little in common with their Italian brethren to leave a lasting impression on them.

Byron and Shelley alone of English poets of their time, to quote Matthew Arnold once more, 'attempted to apply freely the modern spirit.' And it is they who, together with Swinburne, an aristocrat like themselves, have won a recognised position, at least in Italian eyes, like Leopardi or Hugo, Goethe or Heine, in the European literature of the century. Byron's influence can hardly be exaggerated. It was universal on the continent and nowhere more powerful than in Italy.

He almost has a place beside Leopardi and Foscolo as a poet of the national cause and his relations with the Carbonari of Romagna prove that he was ready to die for Italy, as he afterwards died for Greece. His house was filled with their arms, and it was only the crushing of the Neapolitan Republic, the proclamation of which inspired Shelley's *Ode to Naples*, that prevented a rising. Guerrazzi, the novelist and one of the Tuscan Triumvirs, declared that Niagara itself could not have affected him so much as 'the contemplation of that mighty spirit,' and his early novels are written almost entirely under Byron's influence. Mazzini was no less enthusiastic. An eager devourer of Byron literature, he refused to admit that the poet was more to blame than his wife in the quarrel, though he confessed that he was too much of a partisan to be able to judge impartially. He never forgave England her neglect of her 'only poet who will live in time to come.' 'I wish I had time to write before dying a book on Byron and abuse all England, a few women excepted, for the way she treats one of her greatest souls and minds,' he wrote to Peter Taylor; and he began to plan the book when in prison at Gaeta. Byron was not Mazzini's ideal poet, but he loved Italy and at least 'there is the man himself who hopes and strives and suffers for the race,' like Dante and Aeschylus; the proud, uncontrolled will, 'aspiring to rule the world round him solely for dominion's sake, to exercise upon it the Titanic force of his will.' There is hardly a writer of the time in whom Byron's influence cannot be traced, and he had a whole school of poetic disciples in Calabria.

Translations of his works have been countless from 1817 onwards, 'beginning with Pellegrino Rossi,' says Carducci, 'with Guerrazzi, with Mazzini, through Nicolini and Maffei, to the latest scribbler in the supplements of popular papers. A whole library, I tell you, and some of them not merely able, but among the best in the languages of continental Europe.' Carducci himself learnt English late in life and was, of course, well acquainted with Byron. But the great poet of the *Risorgimento* was a merciless critic of his age and took its faults deeply to heart. 'Every stanza is a slap in the face to something,' he declares of his poems. Byron had so many great qualities, and there was so much in him to make Italians love him that it pains Carducci to have to confess a doubt whether 'as a poet, we may not have loved him for his faults.' In a sonnet which he sent to a friend with a copy of the poet's works he says that it is not the Byron who veiled his sorrows under a cynical laugh whom he admires, but the Byron who, 'radiant

with fateful valour,' answered the appeal of a people fighting for liberty.

But Byronism is dead even in Italy. Though D'Annunzio, of course, knows his Byron and quotes him in *Il Piacere*, he does not appear to have been especially attracted to him. Yet the two men have much in common. D'Annunzio possesses the uncompromising egoism, the earnestness, the fearless flaunting of his own life, in all its aspects, in the face of the world, regardless of public opinion, that characterise the earlier poet; but for D'Annunzio there has been no hallowing Missolonghi, though the *Canzone della Gesta d' Oltremare* has won him a place in the hearts of all patriotic Italians.

Shelley's influence cannot be compared with Byron's. Even now, according to Carducci, though Italy puts up monuments to him, she does not read him. An Italian version of a portion of his works appeared as early as 1858, but Carducci could find no copy of Shelley in an important library before 1885. Mazzini mentioned him twice as a possible translator of *Faust* and Nicolini's play is based upon the *Cenci*, as he himself admits, but his criticisms show how utterly he failed to understand Shelley. This much Carducci tells us in his interesting preface to a prose version of the *Prometheus Unbound* by Ettore Sanfelice (1894), who also translated the *Cenci*. In 1892, the centenary of Shelley's birth, a scholarly rendering of *The Sensitive Plant* in the original metre was brought out by A. de Bosis, who has made other excellent translations from Shelley, which he steadily declines to publish. In Carducci's opinion the reasons for this comparative neglect are three in number. Shelley's poetry is too far removed from Italian ideas of what constitutes poetry during the last three centuries. Then, incredible though it may sound, he is too classical, and, most important of all, he is too much of an idealist for a material age like the present.

This last reason probably did as much to delay his recognition in England as in Italy. Shelley was too aethereal, too far removed from the actual world to exercise the influence of Byron. Yet the work of the 'poet of a world set free' is rated at its proper value by all true lovers of poetry in Italy. Indeed, he was the great discovery for the generation of Italian men of letters that is now passing away. The *Cenci* and the *Prometheus Unbound* have been enthusiastically admired. Shelley's love for and understanding of Italy was perhaps greater than Byron's. In the opinion of such a critic as Enrico Nencioni, Shelley's well-known description of the Baths of Caracalla, where the second

and third acts of *Prometheus Unbound* were written, in his letter to Peacock, is rivalled only by Carducci's ode on the same subject; and the famous tomb in the Protestant cemetery by the Aurelian walls inspired one of the greatest of Carducci's odes, the *Presso l' Urna di P. B. Shelley.* No modern poet, he declares, deserves a place in his fabled Isle of the Heroes, 'unless perhaps it be thou, Shelley, Titan spirit in a maiden's form: Sophocles caught thee from the living embrace of Thetis and wafted thee to the bands of the heroes.' The same poet's *I Due Titani* obviously owes something to the *Prometheus Unbound.*

But Shelley's influence is most noticeable in the work of Mario Rapisardi, Carducci's vigorous aggressor, where it is rivalled only by that of Lucretius. An atheist, the author of several epics, among them *Lucifero,* in which the Prince of Darkness is represented as overthrowing and killing a Deity in whom he does not believe, Rapisardi was naturally attracted to Shelley and published a good translation of *Prometheus Unbound* at the time of the Shelley celebrations in 1892.

Keats, on the other hand, has had no influence in Italy. It is true that Maria and Andrea go to look for his grave after seeing Shelley's in *Il Piacere,* but D'Annunzio makes no reference to the touching inscription, which would not in any case have appealed to one of his temperament. He speaks of him as the author of *Endymion,* but shows no knowledge of his work; and it is noteworthy that the house where Keats died in Rome has been converted into a museum for both Keats and Shelley[1].

But for Shelley—'Percy Shelley,' as he always calls him, seeming to linger affectionately on the mere sound of the name—D'Annunzio has a genuine admiration. In *Il Piacere* he is 'the divine Ariel, fed on light and speaking the language of the spirits.' D'Annunzio delivered a commemorative address on Shelley in Naples in 1892, in which he calls him 'the greatest English poet of the century, one of the greatest poets of the world.' Like Swinburne, D'Annunzio is forcible and impetuous, with a tendency to superlatives, and he goes on to describe *Prometheus Unbound* as the greatest poem of the century, perhaps even greater than *Faust,* while he is hardly less enthusiastic in his praise of the *Ode to the West Wind.* The story of Shelley's death and of the finding of his heart, the *cor cordium,* made a profound impression upon him. He refers to it again in the *Trionfo della Morte.* When the

[1] The establishment of the museum, however, has not been altogether without effect. Ettore Allodoli has recently published versions of Keats's *Hyperion, Isabella, Odes* and *Sonnets* (Milan, 1913).

suicidal mania finally takes possession of Giorgio Aurispa, he begins to plan means of making away with himself, and as he gazes out to sea in the lonely Abbruzzi village by the shore, he thinks with longing of Shelley's end and of passing through the sea 'into something rich and strange.' The whole idea of D'Annunzio's *Sogno di un Mattino di Primavera* is taken from Shelley's *Sunset*, and the subject is one which would irresistibly attract the Italian poet.

In the course of his address D'Annunzio quotes from the *Revolt of Islam*:

> Reproach not thine own soul, but know thyself,
> Nor hate another's crime, nor loathe thine own.
> It is the dark idolatry of self,
> Which, when our thoughts and actions once are gone,
> Demands that man should weep, and bleed, and groan;
> O vacant expiation! Be at rest—
> The past is Death's, the future is thine own;
> And love and joy can make the foulest breast
> A paradise of flowers, where peace might build her nest.

These lines, he tells us, might have formed the epilogue to the saddest, the most tragic of Dostoievsky's novels. Shelley's Cythna might be Sonia's sister. Anyone who remembers the sudden flash of self-revelation in the lines to his mother and sisters in the *Laus Vitae*, when for one moment the mask is dropped and the poet sees his life as they would see it, will instantly realise the significance of these lines of Shelley to D'Annunzio.

Meredith once remarked that Swinburne, had he been born an Italian, would have been hailed as the national poet. Though he never came to know Italy as Byron and Shelley knew it, never sought a refuge there from outraged public opinion at home, he had been brought up by his mother to love the country from his earliest childhood and no Englishman was ever a more devoted son of Italy than he. His mother taught him Italian at a very early age, and he remembered reading the *Orlando Furioso* long before the *Faerie Queene*.

> Ah heaven, bow down, be nearer! This is she,
> Italia, the world's wonder, the world's care;
> Free in her heart ere quite her hands be free,
> And lovelier than her loveliest robe of air.
> The earth has voice, and speech is in the sea,
> Sounds of great joy, too beautiful to bear;
> All things are glad because of her, but we
> Most glad, who loved her when the worst days were,
> First love and last love, light of lands.

Like most of their countrymen, the great Victorian poets were ardent supporters of the Italian cause, but their point of view was

altogether English. Though the Brownings lived for years in Italy, they remained English to the core and wrote of the *Risorgimento* in Florence much as their countrymen felt about it at home. Swinburne, on the other hand, was writing of it in England like an Italian who had been out in '48. As Mr Gosse has told us, 'he was not merely a poet, but a flag; not merely a flag, but the red flag incarnate,' in full revolt against the intellectual and moral prejudices of his age and country, which his fellow-poets before the Pre-Raphaelite movement fully shared. Mazzini was his master and the ideal, universal Republic of his dreams was Swinburne's ideal, which he has celebrated in the *Songs before Sunrise.* Nor did he ever waver in his faith. His poems teem with references to it and he hated the 'Tedeschi' to his dying day with a truly Italian hatred. It is noteworthy that he alone of the Pre-Raphaelite poets, if he is to be classed among them, owes more to Shelley than to Keats. Patriotic Englishman though he was, Swinburne could understand and sympathise with

> the school-boy heat,
> the blind hysterics of the Celt,

which only roused contempt in Tennyson's insular soul. The young Maupassant was as forcibly struck by the Latin character of Swinburne's mind as by the strangeness of such Republican sentiments coming from his aristocratic lips.

No one acquainted with Carducci can fail to be struck by the similarity between the point of view of the early and middle period of his work and that of *Poems and Ballads,* or the *Songs before Sunrise.* The Italian poet first caught the public ear with his *Ode to Satan* at the time of the Oecumenical Council of 1870, for which Swinburne wrote his *Ode to Man.* Swinburne's sympathies were Greek rather than Latin and the old Pagan religion could not mean to him all that it meant to Carducci, conscious of the Latin blood in his very veins. But the *Hymn to Proserpine,* in which he prophesies the downfall of Christianity, or *Before a Crucifix,* breathe all Carducci's hatred of the Semitic God and the ascetic side of Christianity, as we see it in *In una Chiesa Gotica* or in the magnificent *Alle Fonti del Clitumno.*

> Roma
> Più non trionfa.
> Più non trionfa, poichè un galileo
> Di rosse chiome il Campidoglio ascese,
> Gittolle in braccia una croce, e disse
> —Portala e servi.

A poet's fame usually spreads slowly outside his own country. How many people in England read D'Annunzio's poems, which are undoubtedly his best work, for the numbers who know his novels? Dr Johnson was right in saying that a poet is the best preserver of a language, since he cannot be duly appreciated except in the original. Yet Mr Gosse informs us that Swinburne was disappointed that death interfered with a projected translation of his poems into Italian and the French version may have helped to make him known in the peninsula; but the enthusiasm of an Italian critic has probably done more for him there than anything else.

English literature in Italy owes a great debt to Enrico Nencioni. Thanks to him his countrymen have been brought into direct contact with it instead of having to wait for it to filter through France. He was one of the 'Amici pedanti,' the brilliant group of friends of which Carducci was the centre and which also included Giuseppe Chiarini, the poet's biographer, himself an admirer of our literature. Nencioni was not a great original critic, but a man of taste and wide culture and a passionate lover of good literature, who possessed that fuller insight into poetry which is hardly ever found except in critics with some poetical gift of their own. Consequently, when at the age of forty he was invited to abandon his work as a private tutor in aristocratic families and come to Rome by his old friend, the editor of the *Fanfulla della Domenica*, then at the height of its fame, he rapidly established his position in the world of letters, especially for his knowledge of English literature, to which the volume of his *Saggi critici della Letteratura Inglese*, contributed to the *Nuova Antologia* and the *Fanfulla della Domenica* bears witness. Indeed, he soon came to be regarded as a kind of official interpreter of our literature in Italy, and he was ready to welcome the new generation to the end. Stevenson he duly appreciated, but *Plain Tales from the Hills* was a trial to him. In the last of his papers he warns his readers that after the 'wearisome dialect of so many English novels' they are now expected to swallow 'whole mouthfuls of Hindustani.' He sighs as he reflects that there is nothing to prevent the different dialects of Africa from cropping up in the next new English novelist, and fears that the critic of the future will have to qualify himself by a course at the Propaganda if he is to keep up with the times. The complaint comes rather strangely from Italy, where differences of dialect amount almost to differences of language and the novel is therefore essentially regional.

His essay on *I Poeti Inglesi Moderni e i Nuovi Canti di Mary*

Robinson, from which the following estimate of Swinburne is taken, attests the grip he had acquired of his subject. Swinburne, he tells us, possesses

> the sense of the pure plastic beauty of antiquity, of the great art of Greece; the splendid colouring of a boundless imagination that recalls the marvellous poetry of the Elizabethan age; a music in his verse and in his poetic period such as has not been heard since Shelley's death, which ranges from the wail of the flute and the plaintive note of the nightingale to the full peal of the organ and the awful harmony of the ocean; a profound feeling for and understanding of nature as seen in her most sublime manifestations, in great visions of the sky and the sea; a whole-hearted loyalty to his republican and humanitarian ideals, which he advocates with inspired eloquence. Besides these lyrical qualities, he is endowed with critical and dramatic instincts that enable him to reconstruct the past and reincarnate its characters, animating them with a breath of immortal life that reminds us that he is Shakespeare's countryman.

To Nencioni, who was well read in the Elizabethan dramatists, the *Cenci* and Swinburne's *Mary Stuart* trilogy were the most Shakespearian products of English literature since the death of Shakespeare himself, and we may be sure that the Queen of Scots owes the enthusiasm of her Italian champion to Swinburne's influence. *Sebald* and *Ottima* in *Pippa Passes* might, in his opinion, possibly be ranked with them; for Nencioni knew and admired Browning, especially *Pippa Passes* and *The Ring and the Book*.

> Swinburne (he proceeds) can echo the great voices of Nature, setting her before us in her sounds rather than in her colours....He has the painter's melody of Shelley and like him he is impassioned in his descriptions of nature....He pursues her divine footsteps with the fire of the gods of old pursuing the white nymphs through the woods, clasping her in a fiery embrace. There is nothing of the miniature, nothing idyllic or didactic in his descriptions. They are like those of Victor Hugo, or rather of Shelley; and as Shelley is the first of painter-poets of the sky, so Swinburne is unrivalled as the painter-poet of the sea.

With such an advocate it would be strange if Swinburne were not appreciated by the cultivated few in Italy and he has not been altogether without influence there. Indeed, many of his countrymen will perhaps be surprised at the high place assigned him. Nencioni was among the first to recognise D'Annunzio's promise when a mere schoolboy. Nor did he withdraw his helping hand, like Chiarini, when the sensuous element in his work proved to be no mere youthful indiscretion, but an integral part of his nature; and to Nencioni's influence may be ascribed not a little of D'Annunzio's interest in and knowledge of our literature.

Chiarini, author of a volume of Shakepeare studies, shares Nencioni's enthusiasm.

Algernon Charles Swinburne is the most richly endowed poetic nature that England has produced since Shelley. Others may be more perfect artists than he, but he is more of a poet than them all: he is a poet born. And within his breast beats something of the heart of Shelley and Byron. Passionately devoted to his art, like all the great poets who were his contemporaries, in so far as he is, politically and socially, a revolutionary, he is the descendant and literary heir of these two great spirits.

Chiarini has printed an interesting letter from Nencioni to himself in his *Life* of Carducci. Nencioni describes how he wandered into the bookseller Goodban's at Florence and noticed a handsome volume, bound in blue cloth, lying there. 'Drawn as by a magnetic current, I take it up and read, Swinburne's *Bothwell*—"So you have got *Bothwell*! Is this your only copy?"'—(Nencioni had ordered copies for Chiarini and himself)—'Oh, that one came by post a week ago for Mr Russell, but he would not have it because there is a page torn.' Goodban was going to send it back. On hearing that the price was twenty-four lire, plus twenty per cent. commission, Nencioni offered twenty francs for it as it was, but Goodban refused, saying he intended to give the publisher a lesson. 'I fled to prevent myself offering twenty-four, thirty, forty lire, anything he liked to ask....The hound Goodban gave me his word that by June 30th at latest we shall have our two copies. I shall dream of the book till I get it.' When we remember how small is the income of an Italian private tutor, we realise the sacrifices Nencioni was willing to make to satisfy his passion for literature.

Rapisardi of course made the acquaintance of a poet who looked up to Shelley and Landor and Mazzini as his masters, and who habitually vituperated the Deity. He translated Swinburne's *In Memory of Aurelio Saffi* in *Empedocle ed altri Versi*, and it is under Swinburne's influence that this wrong-headed, yet forcible writer, who lacked humour and common sense, for one moment touched a really high level of poetry. *Mors et Vita* and *Felicità*, the best poems in this volume, have a directness and a lyrical depth which we look for in vain elsewhere in his work. Here at least the thought seems to come into being with the metre, which is modelled on that of *Dolores* and which he nowhere else uses. Swinburne's influence is surely to be traced here. In *Felicità* Happiness is seated on a rock, round which surges a sea of suffering humanity, vainly trying to reach her and crying, 'Ah, can no one, no one even so much as kiss thy bright shore? If thou art an empty dream, why do I yearn for thee beyond all else[1]?'

[1] Ahi, sempre sul monte starai
col guardo su' naufragi, o diva?
Nessuno, nessuno potrà mai
baciar la tua fulgida riva?

'O unconquered Sphinx, O Idea that shinest above us in silent splendour,' runs the last stanza, 'O fair, impassible goddess, may it not be that thou art Death[1]?'

The thought and the tone of the longer *Mors et Vita* are much the same. 'O human soul, thou little child that, yearning for the fleeting Deity, and seated between an urn and a cradle, weavest the web of thy dreams....Life and Death in close embrace gaze upon thee from the steep path and with brows bent over the vast abyss whisper, Mystery[2].'

Phrases from our poets often seem to haunt D'Annunzio—'All the perfumes of Araby,' for instance, or Ben Jonson's 'O so whyte, O so soft, O so sweet, so sweet, so sweet is she,' which he quotes in *Forse che si, forse che non.* Nor is it difficult to find traces of his reading in a writer whose profound culture forms so integral a part of his nature. In *Le Vergini delle Rocce* it is Leonardo, in *Il Trionfo della Morte* Shelley, in the *Poema Paradisiaco* Miss Mary Robinson's poems, to which he was obviously introduced by Nencioni, and in *Forse che si, forse che non* Swinburne, who could hardly fail to appeal to such a master of style. And reminiscences of Swinburne are common in D'Annunzio. He puts a translation of the last four stanzas of *The Bloody Son* into the mouth of the child's governess in *Forse che si, forse che non,* and gives a similar prose version of

> Swallow, my sister, O singing swallow,
> I know not how thou hast heart to sing,

and of other stanzas of *Itylus*, which Swinburne wrote in a garden in Fiesole, 'the whole air vociferous with nightingales.' *Fedra* shows distinct traces of the English poet's play on the same subject. Many of these echoes of Swinburne have been pointed out recently in *Notes*

> Se vano miraggio tu sei,
> se vuoto fantasma di sogno,
> perchè più del ver tu mi béi?
> perchè più di tutto io ti agogno?
>
> [1] O Sfinge indomabile, o Idea
> che tacita splendi lassù,
> o bianca, impassibile dea,
> non forse la Morte sei tu?
>
> [2] O anima umana, fanciulla
> che il nume fuggevole agogni,
> e assisa fra un' urna e una culla
> ritessi la tela dei sogni....
> La Vita e la Morte abbracciate
> vi guardano dall' arduo sentiero,
> e al baratro immenso piegate
> le fronti, susurran: Mistero.

and Queries and, like several other parallels in this article, in Benedetto Croce's well-known review, *La Critica*. The song in *La Gioconda*,

> Eravamo sette sorelle,
> Ci specchiammo alle fontane,

is an imitation of *The King's Daughter*, while the refrain to the lovely *O Lunella, mia Lunella*, sung by Moriccica to her little sister in *Forse che si, forse che non*,

> Finchè tu ti rammenti,
> Finchè io non mi scordi,

is obviously suggested by Swinburne.

The two men have many points in common, not the least being a passion for the sea. D'Annunzio may not take the physical delight in swimming which Swinburne, who was known as 'Seamew' in his youth, has expressed in *The Swimmer's Dream* or in the poem on the Lac de Gaube; but Swinburne's picture of Tristram leaping towards the sea's breast with a cry of love 'as towards a mother's where his head might rest' may be compared with the beautiful description of Andrea Sperelli's convalescence by the September sea after the duel in *Il Piacere*.

> The sea had for him the mysterious attraction of a country of his own; and he gave himself up to it with the sublime confidence of a child, of a weakly child sinking into the arms of an almighty father. And he received comfort from it; for no one has ever confided his sorrow, his longing or his dream to the sea in vain.... The sea had always some word of profound import for him and was full of sudden revelations, of flashes of unexpected light, of unlooked-for meanings....It would lay open a wound in his secret soul, still living, though deep suppressed, and draw blood from it; but the sweetness of its healing balm was only increased thereby.

To D'Annunzio, as to Swinburne, love is sensuous rather than passionate, but D'Annunzio's sensuousness goes so far beyond that of Swinburne, or of any other modern writer, that he can pass by poems such as *Rococo* or *Laus Veneris*, which were highly praised by Nencioni, with comparative indifference. It is the pagan, lyric melancholy, 'the desire of beauty quickened by the sense of death,' with the exquisite rhythm and melody of this spirit of flame and music that attract him; for D'Annunzio, like Swinburne, is essentially a lyric poet. To him Swinburne's charm is altogether aesthetic. D'Annunzio's last poems have proved him to be as patriotic an Italian as Swinburne was an Englishman, but he is an aristocrat of the aristocrats, who regards the mob as born to serve and would use the whip rather than the sword to keep it in subjection. Though he suddenly went over to the Extreme Left during his brief career as a politician, he has lost none of his hatred

of modern popular government as it exists in Rome, 'the grey flood of the democracy of to-day that whelms so many rare and beautiful things beneath its tide.' Hence he has no sympathy with Swinburne's paeans to liberty and to Mazzini's universal republic.

Lacy Collison-Morley.

London.

Since this article was written the first volume of Signor Emilio Cecchi's interesting and suggestive *Storia della Letteratura Inglese nel Secolo XIX* (Milano, Treves, 1915) has appeared. It shows conclusively how completely Byron's star has waned before that of Shelley in Italy. D'Annunzio's *Parisina* owes nothing to Byron, except the nightingale's song and the scarf Parisina gives her lover. The important part played by D'Annunzio in recent political developments in Italy serves to reinforce our remarks concerning the genuineness of his patriotism.

THE LAURENTIAN TEXT (*COD. LAURENT.* XXIX, 8) OF DANTE'S LETTER TO A FRIEND IN FLORENCE (*EPIST.* IX),

WITH EMENDED TEXT AND TRANSLATION.

DANTE'S letter to a Friend in Florence (*Epist.* IX in the *Oxford Dante*) has been preserved in one MS. only, in the Laurentian Library at Florence (XXIX, 8), which contains also Dante's letter to the Italian Cardinals (*Epist.* VIII), and that to a Pistojan exile, commonly identified with Cino da Pistoja (*Epist.* IV), of neither of which is any other MS. known; as well as the letter of Frate Ilario to Uguccione della Faggiuola, and the Latin poetical correspondence between Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio. This MS. belonged to Boccaccio, and the portion containing the three letters of Dante, and the other pieces above mentioned, is in his handwriting; it was executed probably about the year 1348[1].

This letter, which was written by Dante probably in 1315, to a correspondent who has been conjectured to be his brother-in-law, Teruccio Donati[2], scornfully rejecting the offer of a return to Florence under certain degrading conditions, was utilised by Boccaccio in his *Vita di Dante*. In the chapter headed *Qualità e Difetti di Dante* he writes:

Fu il nostro poeta, oltra alle cose predette, di animo alto e disdegnoso molto; tanto che cercandosi per alcuno suo amico il quale a istanza de' suoi prieghi il faceva, ch' egli potesse ritornare in Firenze (il che egli oltre ad ogni altra cosa sommamente desiderava) nè trovandosi a ciò alcun modo con coloro li quali il governo della republica alloro aveano nelle mani, se non uno, il quale era questo, che egli per certo spazio stesse in prigione, e dopo quello in alcuna solennità publica fosse misericordievolemente alla nostra principale chiesa offerto, e per conseguente libero e fuori d' ogni condennagione per adrieto fatta di lui; la qual cosa parendogli convenirsi e usarsi in qualunche è depressi e non infami uomini e non in altri, perchè oltra al suo maggiore desiderio, preelesse di stare in esilio, anzi che per cotal

[1] See Hauvette, *Notes sur des Manuscrits autographes de Boccace à la Bibliothèque Laurentienne*, p. 50.

[2] See A. della Torre in *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. XII, p. 160.

via tornare in casa sua. O isdegno laudevole di magnanimo, quanto virilmente operasti riprimendo l' ardente disio del ritornare per via meno che degna a uomo nel grembo della filosofia notricato![1]

The letter was first printed, in a very imperfect text, at Verona in 1790, by G. J. Dionisi, in the fifth volume (pp. 176–7) of his *Serie di Aneddoti*, and was reprinted by him at Verona in an emended, but still far from satisfactory, text in his *Preparazione istorica e critica alla nuova edizione di Dante Allighieri* in 1806 (Vol. I, pp. 71–3). The letter was reproduced, avowedly from Dionisi's original text, but with sundry modifications, by F. Cancellieri in his *Osservazioni sopra l' Originalità della Divina Commedia di Dante*, published at Rome in 1814 (pp. 59–60); and a few years later by De Romanis in the notes to his edition of Tiraboschi's *Vita di Dante* (Roma, 1817, pp. 46–7). In 1823 Ugo Foscolo reprinted the MS. text (into which he introduced several patent blunders) in his *Essays on Petrarch* (pp. 276–7), with an English translation (pp. 203–5). In the same year the letter was reprinted at Florence from Dionisi's *Aneddoti*, with several variations, in the second edition of Giuseppe Pelli's *Memorie per servire alla Vita di Dante* (p. 204). In 1827 Witte printed the letter at Padua in his *Dantis Alligherii Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* VIII, pp. 65–6). Witte's text was reprinted (with certain modifications) at Florence by Fraticelli in 1840, in *Dantis Alighierii Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* V, pp. 282–6); and at Leghorn by Torri in 1842, in *Epistole di Dante Allighieri edite e inedite* (*Epist.* XIII, pp. 96–8). In 1845 the letter was printed once more from the MS. in *Tre Epistole Latine di Dante Allighieri*, published at Prato (*Epist.* III, pp. 23–5) by Luigi Muzzi, whose professedly critical text is, however, vitiated by sundry arbitrary and uncalled for emendations, several of which, as appears from the Italian translation which he printed at the same time, were evidently due to his misunderstanding of the original. In 1857 Fraticelli published at Florence a revised text, with conjectural emendations of his own, in *Dantis Alighierii Epistolae* (*Epist.* X, in *Opere Minori di Dante*, ed. 1893, Vol. III, pp. 500–2), which was reprinted (with a few variations) at Florence in 1882 by Giuliani in *Le Opere Latine di Dante Allighieri* (*Epist.* IX,

[1] Ed. Macrì-Leone, § 12. In the so-called *Compendio*, which Barbi has proved to be a revised version of the *Vita*, due to Boccaccio himself (see *Bull. Soc. Dant.*, N.S. XXI, p. 48), the account is much briefer: 'Fu adunque il nostro Poeta, oltre alle cose di sopra dette, d' animo altiero e disdegnoso molto, tanto che cercandosi per alcuno amico come egli potesse in Firenze tornare, nè altro modo trovandosi, se non che egli per alcuno spazio di tempo stato in prigione, fosse misericordievolmente offerto a San Giovanni, fu per lui a ciò, ogni fervente disio del ritornare calcato, risposto, che Iddio togliesse via, che alcuno che nel seno della filosofia allevato e cresciuto fosse, divenisse candelotto del suo comune.' (Ed. Rostagno, § 22.)

Vol. II, pp. 32–3)[1]; and at Oxford in 1894 (and again in 1897 and 1904) by Dr Moore in the Oxford Dante (*Epist.* IX, pp. 413–14). A diplomatic transcript of the MS. text was published in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* for May—June 1905 (N.S. XII, pp. 122–3) by Arnaldo della Torre, several of whose proposed emendations were introduced into the latest reprint of the letter, namely that of Passerini[2], in his edition of *Le Opere Minori di Dante* (Firenze, 1910, *Epist.* IX, pp. 96–100).

At the end of last year (1914), in (belated) commemoration of the sixth centenary of the birth of Boccaccio (1313), a facsimile of the whole of *Cod. Laurent.* XXIX. 8 was published at Florence[3]. By means of this facsimile I have been able to make a fresh transcript of the MS. text of *Epist.* IX, which is subjoined below, together with an *apparatus criticus*, in which are registered variant readings from the printed editions enumerated above. The various editions in question are represented in the *apparatus criticus* as follows:

D^1. = Dionisi (1790); D^2. = Dionisi (1806); C. = Cancellieri (1814); R. = De Romanis (1817); Fo. = Foscolo (1823); Pe. = Pelli (1823); W. = Witte (1827); F^1. = Fraticelli (1840); T. = Torri (1842); M. = Muzzi (1845); F^2. = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani (1882); O. = Oxford Dante (1904); To. = A. della Torre (1905); P. = Passerini (1910); D^1.—P. = D^1.D^2.C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F^1.T.M.F^2.G.O.P., it being understood that any edition mentioned independently in the same note is excluded[4].

Appended is a trial list of proposed emendations in the 'standard' text as printed in the Oxford Dante, together with a transcript of the text as emended, and an English translation of the same.

As in the case of previous transcripts printed in this *Review*, the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics. The punctuation of the MS., such as it is, has been preserved. For convenience of reference, as before, the text of the letter has been broken up into paragraphs, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of the sections in the Oxford Dante. In the MS. the letter, which is without title, and follows immediately after that to the Pistojan exile (*Epist.* IV), occupies the last twelve lines (ll. 43–54, numbered in round brackets in the transcript) of fol. 63ro.

[1] The principal divergencies from the MS. of Fraticelli's text were registered by O. Zenatti in *Dante e Firenze* (p. 532); as were those of Giuliani's text by G. Mazzoni in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* for March—April, 1898 (N.S. V, p. 98, n. 1).

[2] This reprint is disfigured by several careless misprints, which will be found registered in the *apparatus criticus* below.

[3] *Lo Zibaldone Boccaccesco Mediceo Laurenziano* (*Plut.* XXIX, 8). In Firenze, presso Leo S. Olschki, MCMXIV.

[4] For example, note 2 on p. 64 indicates that M. follows the MS. and reads *et*, while all the other editions read *ex*.

[ ][1].

[§ 1.] (43) In licteris uestris *et* reuerentia debita *et* affectione receptis quam repatriatio mea cure sit uobis *et*[2] animo grata mente ac diligenti animauersione[3] (44) concepi / *et* inde[4] tanto me districtius obligastis[5] quanto rarius exules inuenire amicos contingit. Ad illarum[6] vero signnificata[7] responsio *et* si non erat qualem[8] forsan (45) pusillanimitas appeteret aliquorum ut sub examine uestri consilij[9] ante iudicium uentiletur[10] affectuose deposco.

[§ 2.] Ecce igitur quod per licteras uestri meique nepotis (46) nec non aliorum quam plurium[11] amicorum signnificatum est mihi per ordinamentum nuper factum[12] Florentie[13] super absolutione bannitorum quod si soluere uellem certam (47) pecunie quantitatem uellemque pati notam oblationis[14] *et* absolui possem[15] *et* redire ad[16] presens In qua[17] quidem duo ridenda *et* male preconsiliata[18] sunt (48) pater dico male preconsiliata[18] per illos qui talia[19] expresserunt nam uestre lictere discretius *et* consultius clasulate. nicil de talibus continebant.

[§ 3.] Est ne ista (49) reuocatio gratiosa[20] qua dantes allagherii[21] reuocatur ad patriam per trilustrium fere perpessus[22] exilium. hoc ne[23] meruit innocentia[24] manifesta quibuslibet. hoc[25] sudor *et* labor (50) continuatus in studio[26] absit a uiro philosophie domestico temeraria tantum[27]

[1] There is no title to the letter in MS.; $D^1.D^2$. *Epistola di Dante*; $F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P.$ *Amico Florentino.*

[2] So M.; D^1.—P. *ex.*

[3] So $D^1.C.R.Fo.$; $D^2.Pe.W.F^1.T.M.F^2.G.O.P.$ *animadversione.*

[4] So $M.F^2.G.O.P.$; $D^1.D^2.C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F^1.T.$ *etenim.*

[5] So D^1.—P.; D^2. *obligatis.*

[6] So $D^1.D^2.Pe.W.F^1.T.M.F^2.G.O.P.$; C.Fo. *illam*; *R. illorum.*

[7] So D^1.—P., though D^1 erroneously gives *singula* as the MS. reading.

[8] So M.; $D^1.D^2.C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F^1.T.$ *respondeo, et si non eatenus qualiter*; $F^2.G.O.P.$ *respondeo*; *et si responsio non erit qualiter*; D^1. erroneously gives the MS. reading as *erit* instead of *erat*; To. holds *erat* to be untenable, and proposes to read *erit.*

[9] C. *concilii.*

[10] So $D^1.D^2.C.R.Pe.W.F^1.T.M.F^2.O.$; Fo. *consilii sit ante judicium*; G. *consilii antea judicium ventiletur*; P. *consilii judicium ventiletur.*

[11] Fo. *quamplurimum.*

[12] D^2. *ordinationem nuper factam.*

[13] P. *Florentiam* (!).

[14] M. *oblatoris.*

[15] $W.F^1.T.$ *posse*; D^1.—P. *possem.*

[16] Fo. *at.*

[17] So P.; D^1.—O. *quo.*

[18] C.Fo. *perconsiliata*; D^1.—P. *praeconsiliata.*

[19] $D^1.C.$ *tali*; D^2.—P. *talia.*

[20] $D^1.D^2.C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.$ *gloriosa*; M.To.P. *generosa.*

[21] $D^1.D^2.C.Pe.$ *d. alla.*; R.T.M. *D. Alla.*; Fo. *d. all.*; $W.F^1.$ *Dantes Alligherius*; F^2. *Dantes Alagherii*; G. *Dantes Allagherius*; O. *Dantes Alighierius*; P. *Dantes Alighierius* (!).

[22] Pe. *perpessum.*

[23] $D^1.D^2.C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F^1.$ *Haec ne*; T. *Hanc ne*; $M.F^2.G.O.P.$ *Hoc ne.*

[24] C.Fo. *conscientia*; D^1.—P. *innocentia.*

[25] $D^1.D^2.C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F^1.T.$ *Haec*; $M.F^2.G.O.P.$ *Hoc.*

[26] C.Fo. *studiis*; D^1.—P. *studio.*

[27] So M.P.; D^1.—O. *terreni.*

cordis humilitas ut more cuiusdam cioli[1] et aliorum infamium[2]. quasi uictus[3] ipse se (51) patiatur offerri[4]. absit a uiro predicante iustitiam ut perpessus iniurias / iniuriam inferentibus[5] uelud bene merentibus pecuniam suam soluat[6].

[§ 4.] Non est hec (52) uia redeundi ad patriam pater mi Sed si[7] alia per uos autem[8], deinde per alios inuenitur[9], que fame dantis que honori[10] non deroget illam non lentis passibus acceptabo (53) Quod si per nullam talem florentia introitur[11] numquam Florentiam introibo Quidni? non[12] solis astrorumque specula ubique conspiciam nonne dulcissimas ueritates potero (54) speculari ubique sub celo. Ni prius inglorium ymo ignominiosum. populo Florentino ciuitati[13] me reddam quippe nec panis deficiet.

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. IX.

Title. *For* Amico Florentino *read* [Amico Florentino] *to indicate that the title is an editorial interpolation.*

l. 3. *For* ex animo *read* (*with MS., Muzzi, and Della Torre*) et animo.

ll. 8–9. *For* significata respondeo; et si responsio non erit qualiter *read* (*with MS., Muzzi, and Della Torre*[14]) s. responsio etsi non erit (*MS., Muzzi* erat) qualem.

l. 21. *For* In quo *read* (*with MS.*) In qua[15].

l. 27. *For* revocatio gloriosa *read* (*with MS.*) revocatio gratiosa[16].

l. 28. *For* Dantes Aligherius *read* Dantes Alagherii[17].

[1] W.F[1].T. *scioli*; D[1].—P. *Cioli.*

[2] C. *infamiam*; Fo. *infamia*; D[1].—P. *infamium*; D[1]. gives *infirmium* as the MS. reading, which is doubtful.

[3] So D[2].M.F[2].O.P.; D[1].C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F[1].T.G. *vinctus.* [4] M. *offerre.*

[5] So D[2].M.F[2].G.O.P.; D[1].C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F[1].T. *perpessus injuriam, inferentibus.*

[6] M. *bene merentibus pecunias, suam solvat.* [7] Pe. omits *si.*

[8] So MS.; D[1].C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F[1].T.M.F[2].G.O. *aut*; D[2]. (probably by a misprint) *ut*; To.P. *ante.*

[9] So M.; D[1].—P. *invenietur.*

[10] So D[1].D[2].C.R.Fo.Pe.M.P.; W.T. *quae famae Dantis, quae honori*; F[1].F[2].G.O. *quae famae Dantis atque honori.*

[11] M. *Florentiae introitur*; T. *Florentiâ i.*; G. *Florentiam i.*; D[1].D[2].C.R.Fo.Pe.W.F[1].F[2].O.P. *Florentia i.*; D[1] erroneously gives *foret introitus* as the MS. reading.

[12] So MS. M.; D[1].—P.To. *Nonne.*

[13] So M.P.; D[1].—O. *populo Florentinaeque civitati*; D[1]. erroneously gives *properè Florentiae civitati* as the MS. reading.

[14] See *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. XII, p. 123, nn. c, d.

[15] The antecedent being, as Della Torre observes (*loc. cit.*), 'absolutione bannitorum' of l. 17.

[16] The MS. reading *grosa* can only stand for *gratiosa*; not for *gloriosa* (with Dionisi, etc.), which would be *glosa* in MS.; nor for *generosa* (with Muzzi and Della Torre), which would be *gnosa*. (See my note on *A misreading in Dante's Letter to a Friend in Florence*, in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. XX, pp. 58—9.)

[17] This, as I have pointed out in a previous article (see *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, VII, p. 12, n. 7), is the recognized Latinized form of Dante's name.

l. 33. *For* temeraria terreni cordis humilitas *read* (*with Muzzi, and Della Torre*) temeraria tantum[1] cordis humilitas.

l. 35. *For* quasi victus *read* (*with the early editors*) quasi vinctus[2].

ll. 41–2. *For* per vos aut deinde per alios *read* per vos antecedenter[3], deinde per alios.

l. 42. *For* invenietur *read* (*with MS. and Muzzi*) invenitur.

ll. 42–3. *For* famae Dantis atque honori *read* (*with MS. and the early editors*) famae Dantisque honori.

ll. 50–2. *For* ignominiosum, populo Florentinaeque civitati me reddam *read* (*with MS. and Muzzi*) ignominiosum populo Florentino[4], civitati me reddam.

Text of Epist. IX *as emended*[5].

[Amico Florentino.]

[§ 1.] In literis vestris, et reverentia (2) debita et affectione receptis, quam re-(3)-patriatio mea curae sit vobis et animo, (4) grata mente ac

[1] The MS. reading is in a sense indeterminate, as it may be meant for either *tm*, or *tni*, or *tin*. The last is out of the question here. The second, in order to represent *terreni* (the reading of Dionisi, etc.), should have a loop after the *t*, which, however, might have been accidentally omitted by the scribe. The *tm* of the MS. normally represents *tantum*, which word seems to be required by the construction as the correlative of the *ut* of l. 34.

[2] The MS. reading is *victus*, which, by the accidental omission of the stroke over the *i* (representing *n*), may not improbably be a copyist's error for *vinctus*, the reading adopted by the majority of editors. The sense of *vinctus* ('like a prisoner in bonds') is much more appropriate to the context than that of *victus* (which would imply rather a prisoner of war), the point being that the person who was presented at the *oblatio*, as a preliminary to being pardoned, was either actually or technically a prisoner; if an actual malefactor, he was brought from the prison where he had been confined; if a political offender, he was obliged to cross the threshold of the prison, so as to constitute himself technically a prisoner. (On the *oblatio*, see Zenatti, *Dante e Firenze*, pp. 507 ff.; and *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. XI, p. 29; XII, p. 155.)

[3] The MS. reading is *aut*, with a stroke over it, which is the normal abbreviation of *autem*; but as *autem* cannot possibly be the correct reading, the early editors one and all substituted *aut*. As *u* and *n* are almost indistinguishable in MSS., Della Torre proposes to read *ante*, which is adopted in his text by Passerini; but the recognized abbreviation of *ante* is *aⁿ̃* (with a stroke over the *n*), and it is so written in this MS. where the word occurs at the beginning of the letter (l. 11, 'ante judicium'). On the other hand, it has been pointed out by Rostagno that *ant* with a loop over the *t* is the regular abbreviation of *antecedenter*. As this word suits the sense, and its adoption involves only a very slight departure from the MS. reading, *antecedenter* seems preferable to *ante*. One or other of these would appear to be required as the correlative to the following *deinde*. (See *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* XII, p. 125, n.)

[4] The MS. reads simply *Flor.* without any trace of *que*, the insertion of which was due to Dionisi in the first instance. The restoration of the MS. reading necessitates an alteration in the usual English rendering of this passage. Foscolo and other English translators render: 'unless I first render myself inglorious, nay ignominious, in the eyes of the people and city of Florence.' The sense of the passage as emended would be: 'unless I first return to my native city, disgraced, nay dishonoured, in the eyes of the people of Florence.'

[5] For convenience of reference the numbering of the sections [in square brackets], and of the lines (in round brackets), of the text as printed in the Oxford Dante have been inserted in the emended text.

diligenti animadversione (5) concepi; et inde tanto me districtius (6) obligastis, quanto rarius exules invenire (7) amicos contingit. Ad illarum vero sig-(8)-nificata responsio, etsi non (9) erit qualem forsan pusillanimitas appe-(10)-teret aliquorum, ut sub examine vestri (11) consilii ante iudicium ventiletur, affec-(12)-tuose deposco.

[§ 2.] (13) Ecce igitur quod per litteras vestri (14) meique nepotis, nec non aliorum quam-(15)-plurium amicorum, significatum est mihi (16) per ordinamentum nuper factum Floren-(17)-tiae super absolutione bannitorum: quod (18) si solvere vellem certam pecuniae quanti-(19)-tatem, vellemque pati notam oblationis, (20) et absolvi possem et redire ad praesens. (21) In qua quidem duo ridenda et male prae-(22)-consiliata sunt, Pater; dico male prae-(23)-consiliata per illos qui talia expresserunt, (24) nam vestrae litterae discretius et con-(25)-sultius clausulatae nihil de talibus con-(26)-tinebant.

[§ 3.] (27) Estne ista revocatio gratiosa, qua (28) Dantes Alagherii revocatur ad patriam, (29) per trilustrium fere perpessus exilium? (30) Hocne meruit innocentia manifesta qui-(31)-buslibet? Hoc sudor et labor continuatus (32) in studio? Absit a viro philosophiae (33) domestico temeraria tantum cordis hu-(34)-militas, ut more cuiusdam Cioli et ali-(35)-orum infamium, quasi vinctus ipse se (36) patiatur offerri! Absit a viro praedicante (37) iustitiam ut perpessus iniurias, iniuriam (38) inferentibus, velut benemerentibus, pe-(39)-cuniam suam solvat!

[§ 4.] (40) Non est haec via redeundi ad patriam, (41) Pater mi; sed si alia per vos antecedenter, deinde (42) per alios invenitur, quae famae Dantis-(43)-que honori non deroget, illam non (44) lentis passibus acceptabo. Quod si per (45) nullam talem Florentia introitur, num-(46)-quam Florentiam introibo. Quidni? (47) nonne solis astrorumque specula ubique (48) conspiciam? Nonne dulcissimas verita-(49)-tes potero speculari ubique sub coelo, ni (50) prius inglorium, immo ignominiosum, (51) populo Florentino, civitati me red-(52)-dam? Quippe nec panis deficiet.

Translation.

[To a Friend in Florence.]

[§ 1.] From your letter, which I received with due respect and affection, and have diligently studied, I learn with gratitude how my recall to Florence has been the object of your care and concern; and I am the more beholden to you therefor, inasmuch as it rarely happens

that an exile finds friends. My reply to what you have written, although perchance it be not of such tenour as certain faint hearts would desire, I earnestly beg may be carefully examined and considered by you before judgment be passed upon it.

[§ 2.] I gather, then, from the letter of your nephew and mine[1], as well as from those of sundry other friends, that, by the terms of a decree lately promulgated in Florence touching the pardon of the exiles, I may receive pardon, and be permitted to return forthwith, on condition that I pay a certain sum of money, and submit to the stigma of the oblation[2]—two propositions, my Father, which in sooth are as ridiculous as they are ill-advised, ill-advised, that is to say, on the part of those who have communicated them, for in your letter, which was more discreetly and cautiously formulated, no hint of such conditions was conveyed.

[§ 3.] This, then, is the gracious recall of Dante Alighieri to his native city, after the miseries of well-nigh fifteen years of exile! This is the reward of innocence manifest to all the world, and of the sweat and toil of unremitting study! Far be it from a familiar of philosophy to commit such a senseless act of abasement as voluntarily to present himself, like a felon in bonds, at the oblation, as one Ciolo and other infamous wretches have done! Far be it from the preacher of justice, after suffering wrong, to pay of his money to those that wronged him, as though they had deserved well of him!

[§ 4.] No! my Father, not by this path will I return to my native city. If some other can be found, in the first place by yourself and then by others, which does not derogate from the fame and honour of Dante, that will I tread with no lagging steps. But if by no such path Florence may be entered, then will I enter Florence never. What! can I not anywhere gaze upon the face of the sun and the stars? can I not under any sky contemplate the most precious truths, without I first return to Florence, disgraced, nay dishonoured, in the eyes of my fellow-citizens? Assuredly bread will not fail me!

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

[1] There is reason to suppose that this common nephew of Dante and of his correspondent was one Niccolò Donati, son of Foresino (or Forese) di Manetto Donati, the brother of Dante's wife, Gemma Donati. In this case Dante's correspondent, whom he addresses as 'Pater' (ll. 22, 41), would be another brother of Gemma's, Teruccio di Manetto Donati, who was a member of a religious order, and a bachelor of divinity. (See *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. XII, p. 160.)

[2] See p. 66, n. 2.

ON THE DISPUTED READING IN DANTE'S EPIST. V, 129, 130.

THE ever increasing obligations under which Mr Paget Toynbee is placing students of Dante by his continued investigations into the text of the Epistles remind me that I have long had it on my conscience to defend the received reading of *Epist.* v, 129, 130, 'denegata' against his proposed 'derogata' (*M.L.R.*, VII, pp. 38, 221).

Mr Toynbee's own articles, admirable alike in their industry and their candour, have very greatly supplemented the available evidence on this point. I shall have to travel outside his *dossier* for very little indeed that I have to urge.

The whole passage as printed in the Oxford Dante runs: 'Nam si a prima huius ignis favilla revolvamus praeterita, ex quo scilicet Argis hospitalitas a Phrygibus denegata; et usque ad Octaviani triumphos mundi gesta revisere vacet.' The 'flame' here spoken of is the glory of the Roman Empire, and the 'first spark' is the event described (according to the received reading) as 'Argis hospitalitas a Phrygibus denegata.'

The letter, Mr Toynbee tells us, is preserved in two MSS., the Vatican (Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat. 1729) and the Pantaleo (Cod. S. Pantaleo 8). Both are described by him as of the fourteenth century. The Pantaleo MS. reads 'denegata,' with the received text. The Vatican reads 'deregata' (*M.L.R.*, VII, p. 83, note 11), which is not a word at all. A precisely similar corruption is found e.g., in an early fifteenth century MS. of Manilius which reads in II, 28 'rumina,' a non-existent word, for the correct 'numina' of the other MSS.[1] There seems no reason for dissatisfaction with the received text therefore, unless it should present formidable intrinsic difficulties. Now if the passage has been correctly translated 'by the author of the early Italian Translation... and by all subsequent translators, Italian, English, and German[2],' as

[1] See Housman, M., *Manilii Astronomicon Lib. Sec.*, London, 1912, *ad loc.*
[2] Toynbee, p. 221, end of note 1.

meaning 'the refusal of hospitality to the Argives by the Phrygians,' it does not present any difficulty at all. It is quite true that a modern reader would be more likely to think of the rape of Helen than of the inhospitable refusal of Laomedon to allow the Argonauts to rest on his shores, as the natural starting-point for a history of the Trojan antecedents of Roman history. But that was not so in the Middle Ages. Dares Phrygius begins his *De Excidio Trojae Historia* by telling us of the expedition of the Argonauts, and how they touched at Simois, whereon Laomedon 'mittit ad portum, qui dicant, ut Graeci de finibus excedant, si non dicto obaudissent, sese armis eos de finibus eiecturum.' We then hear no more of the Argonauts, except that they succeeded in their quest and returned. But the indignation of Heracles at this 'refusal of hospitality to the Greeks by the Phrygians' (to adopt Dante's phrase) is followed up in its momentous consequences—the first siege of Troy, the death of Laomedon and the rape of Hesione, the preparations for a renewed struggle by Priam, the embassies to Grecian states to demand the restoration of Hesione, the Greek refusal, the retaliatory rape of Helen by Paris, and all the subsequent history. It is clear enough that Laomedon's churlishness was the 'first spark' that kindled the 'flame,' in the opinion at least of Dares. Mr Toynbee himself cites Brunetto Latini, I, 32, to the same effect. Benoît de Sainte-Maure, in his *Roman de Troie*, follows the same line. He begins with the Argonauts, and goes at immense length into the matters springing out of Laomedon's discourtesy, treating them exactly on the lines of Dares, and it is not till we have come to verse 3650 that the editor can give us the headline 'Délibération; l'expédition de Paris en Grèce est décidée.' Villani too devotes three chapters respectively (i) to the insult to the Argonauts, their vengeance on Laomedon, and the rape of Hesione, (ii) to the restoration of Troy by Priam, and the retaliatory rape of Helen, and (iii) to the second siege and fall of Troy (I, 12—14). Clearly then, though Dante might, if he had chosen, have taken the Helen episode as his starting-point, just as Vincent of Beauvais does in his chapter 'De causa belli Troyani' (II, 60), yet the propriety of the phrase 'prima favilla' is obviously greater if it refers to the traditional origin of the whole trouble than if it is to be taken as referring to a convenient starting-point which was notoriously not the origin.

But then, have we any right to translate 'Argis' 'to the Argives'? In classical Latinity, as Mr Toynbee points out, it ought to mean 'at Argos' and can mean nothing else. And Dante had abundant

means of knowing this. Could he then have used it for 'to the Argives'? Now I have to confess that the difficulty had not occurred to me, and when I translated the passage in 1904 (*Latin Works of Dante*, Temple Classics, p. 312), 'to the Argives,' I did so in pure lightness of heart. But Mr Toynbee himself has now gathered and placed at our service (p. 221) conclusive evidence that in Dante's times 'Argi' was in fact an expressly recognised alternative form of 'Argivi'; so the generally adopted translation is after all unimpeachable. All we translators, it seems, have been either lucky enough not to taste the Pierian spring, or thirsty enough to drink deep of it, and our translation is unassailable. *Laus Deo!* It is difficult to understand what objection can remain to the received reading. It is itself satisfactory, and it satisfactorily explains the only other reading (namely, the admittedly corrupt 'deregata') which any MS. contains.

But in spite of this Mr Toynbee still proposes to treat 'deregata' as a corruption, not of the authenticated 'denegata,' but of a hypothetical 'derogata,' which he would restore, and which was actually introduced by Torri in his edition of the letters. This makes the passage read 'Argis hospitalitas a Phrygibus derogata,' and Mr Toynbee takes it as a reference to the rape of Helen. But this makes the translation a matter of doubt and difficulty. 'Derogare' is properly to 'abrogate' a law. By extension it means to 'slight' or 'derogate from.' Dante uses it twice with perfect propriety, once in *De Monarchia* (III, 3, 58 sq.), when he accuses the Decretalists of slighting the Empire ('Imperio derogant') by their one-sided insistence on the Canon Law; and once in *Epist.* IX, 43, when he stipulates for conditions of return to Florence which shall not 'derogate from' his fair fame and honour ('quae famae Dantis atque honori non deroget'). In our passage 'hospitalitas derogata' if we took it to mean simply 'slighted hospitality' would be somewhat weak, but it is stretching a point to make it mean 'abused hospitality,' as Mr Toynbee does. Let that pass, however. Are we then to take 'Argis' as a locative and translate 'The hospitality abused by the Phrygians at Argos'? This is one of Mr Toynbee's suggestions (p. 221), but of course he sees the objection that it was not at Argos but at Sparta that the violation of the laws of hospitality took place; and he suggests that Argos might stand for Greece at large, as in *Aeneid*, II, 95. Would it be hypercritical to ask whether the locative would still be appropriate? Could you say 'Italiae' for 'somewhere in Italy'? But let that too pass. The translation and exegesis are, to say the least, far from convincing. Mr Toynbee suggests

an alternative. It is to take 'Argis' as equivalent to 'Argivis' after all, but still to keep 'derogata,' and still make the passage refer to Helen. It would then have to be translated 'The hospitality abused to the detriment of the Argives by the Phrygians.' A formal defence of this hardly tolerable construction might perhaps, at need, be based on Lucan's 'Inuidus annoso qui famam derogat aeuo' (IX, 359), cited in the new Thesaurus. But why go out of the way to meet these difficulties when the road is clear? 'The refusal of hospitality to the Argives by the Phrygians' requires no conjectural emendation, involves no strain on the meaning of words or on constructions, admits of no ambiguity, and needs no apology. Is it not going too far in devotion to Helen to strip poor Hesione of the robe in which the received text wraps her, in order to cut it up and remake it as what can after all be nothing but a 'misfit' for her more illustrious rival?

PHILIP H. WICKSTEED.

CHILDREY, WANTAGE.

NOTE.

By the courtesy of the Editor I have had the opportunity of reading the above note before publication. The additional references (to Villani and Benoît de Sainte-Maure) supplied by Mr Wicksteed, and the prominent mention of the same incident which I have myself recently noticed in the *Historia Trojana* of Guido delle Colonne (a work with which Dante was probably acquainted), make it evident that the Laomedon episode was much more widely recognised as a 'historical' landmark by mediaeval writers than I had realised. My argument from the 'obscurity' of that episode, therefore, falls to the ground. Further, since my article was written I have had the good fortune to discover an undoubted instance, in a work familiar to Dante, of the use of *Argi* as the equivalent of *Argivi*, namely in the *Antiqua Translatio* of the *Ethics*. The passage in question occurs in the third book, at the end of the eighth chapter, where Aristotle, speaking of the 'valour of ignorance,' says that those who have gone into a fight under a false apprehension, take to flight as soon as they discover that the situation of affairs is not what they had been led to expect; 'as was the case with the Argives when they fell upon the Lacedæmonians, mistaking them for Sicyonians' —which last sentence is rendered in the *Antiqua Translatio*: 'quod

Argi patiebantur incidentes Laconibus ut Sicioniis' (*Lib.* iii. *Lect.* 17 *ad fin.*).

In the face of these additional data and of the considerations advanced by Mr Wicksteed, it would be difficult any longer to uphold the reading 'derogata.' Consequently the proposed emendation in line 129 of *Epist.* v on p. 221 of Vol. VII of this *Review* should be cancelled, and 'denegata' should be substituted for 'derogata' in the text of the letter printed on p. 154 (last line) of Vol. X.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

'Havelok' Notes.

I.

The regular representative of O.E. *y* (Umlaut of *u*) in *Havelok* is *i*. There is an apparent exception in line 354, where *wolde* occurs in rhyme with *fulde* (= O.E. *fylde*), but this is obviously a scribal error for *wilde* : *filde*, as my friend Mr Sisam points out in his new edition of Skeat's Clarendon Press *Havelok*, p. 107. Cp. amongst other instances *Cursor Mundi*, l. 18759:

> Quen iesus had his spell fulfild,
> and teched þam al þat he wild.

There is also another small class of exceptions where we apparently have the South-Western *u* for O.E. *y*. By the side of *kynemerk* (*Havelok*, l. 604) and *kinneriche* (*Havelok*, l. 976)—the first element of both these compounds is O.E. *cyne*—we get *kunrik* (*Hav.* 2143): 'þat it was kunrik þat he sawe.' This has generally been taken (the alteration was suggested by Stratmann, *Englische Studien*, v, p. 378, followed by Zupitza, *Anglia*, vii, p. 151) to be an error for *kunmerk*: cp. l. 604. But it seems to me that Mr Sisam may be right in suggesting that it is O.N. *kynríkr* (adj.), 'that it was a man of great birth whom they saw.' But in any case the vowel of the first part represents an O.N. or O.E. *y* with *u* for the Midland *i*. We have further in l. 2318 'þe cunnriche eueril del'; l. 2400 'þat king is of þis kuneriche'; and 2804 'was king of þis kunerike,' where we have apparently in the last three instances the M.E. representative of O.E. *cynerīce*. I believe however that the *u* in the first syllable is not the South-Western vowel for O.E. *y*, but is due to Norse influence. The Old Norse word for 'king,' *konungr*, had it is true the root vowel *o*, but in the tenth century the coins of the Scandinavian kings minted in Northumbria spelt the

word with *u* (through the influence in English of the nasal on a preceding *o* changing it to *u*, as in *þunor*). On King Sihtric's coin (A.D. 921–926 or 927) in the British Museum (cp. Brit. Mus. Cat. Pl. XXVIII, 3) the inscription is 'Sitric cununc.' On Regnald's coins (943–944 ?) the title is spelt with *u*. On those of Anlaf (941–944 and 949–952), which are much more frequent, the title (when in English and not the Latin *rex*) is invariably spelt with *u*. Hence I believe that in the spellings in Havelok *kunerike*, etc. the *u* does not denote an *ü* sound, but is simply an Anglicised *u* from O.N. *o* before a nasal.

II.

Havelok, lines 388–393:

> But þat ich wille, þat þo[u] suere
> . . . . . .
> þat þou mine children shalt we[l] yeme,
> þat hire kin be ful wel queme.

Kin is generally taken to be dative and the line to mean: 'that thou shalt take charge of (treat, bring up) my children well, so that it (the treatment) may be full pleasing to their kindred.' I should suggest reading *kinde* (cp. *lon* for *lond* in l. 340) and rendering it: 'so that their character (behaviour) may be full pleasing.' It is true that *kinde* properly means 'inborn quality,' not 'quality produced by bringing up,' but I do not regard this as an insuperable obstacle to my suggestion.

A. S. Napier.

Oxford.

Shakespeare, 'Tempest,' Act I, sc. II, l. 269.

> This blew ey'd hag, was hither brought with child.

The epithet 'blew ey'd' has been variously explained, but it cannot be said to be appropriate in any sense. Shakespeare may probably have written 'blere ey'd' or 'blear ey'd,' and 'blew' is perhaps a misprint of the first folio, which is the only original authority for the text.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Vaughan and D'avenant.

Mr L. C. Martin, in a note to his excellent edition of Vaughan, admits defeat from one passage in the address 'To Sir *William D'avenant*, upon his *Gondibert*.' In this piece Vaughan compliments the Laureate at some length on having discarded all the machinery of '*Spirits, Prodigies*, and *fear*' of which Heroick Poems had hitherto been made up; and he continues:

> This made thy *fire*
> Break through the *ashes* of thy aged *Sire*
> To lend the world such a Convincing light
> As shewes his *fancy* darker than his sight.
> Nor was't alone the *bars* and *length* of dayes
> (Though those gave *strength* and *stature* to his *bayes*,)
> Encounter'd thee, but what's an old Complaint
> And kills the fancy, a *forlorn Restraint*; (ll. 27–34.)

The closing allusion is evidently to D'avenant's imprisonment at Cowes in 1650; for the rest of the passage Mr Martin gives two suggested explanations, that of Mr E. K. Chambers, that the 'aged *Sire*' was perhaps Shakespeare, and that of Mr Percy Simpson, that he was Ben Jonson. But he admits that

> with either explanation, two difficulties remain:
> (i) l. 30. *his fancy darker than his sight.* thy sight? 'his' might be caught from l. 32, 'his *bayes*.'
> (ii) l. 31. *the bars and length of dayes.* *bars*, perhaps difficulties in the poet's career. 'length of dayes' seems more applicable to Jonson than to Shakespeare.

It may be noted that Mr Chambers suggested Shakespeare very tentatively in his edition of Vaughan, and even though Pope's anecdotes about D'avenant be admitted to support the notion that Vaughan would have publicly complimented the knight on his supposed bastardy, the Shakespeare theory is put out of court at once by a consideration of the text. From it two things are clear about the *Sire* in question; that he lived to a great age (the use of '*bars*' is curious, but there is no mistaking the '*length* of dayes[1]') and that he had weak sight. Both these would eliminate Shakespeare, and the second is a strong point against his rival; for although no critic will dispute Mr Percy Simpson's right to speak with authority in regard to Ben Jonson, who was certainly the

[1] Mr G. C. Macaulay suggested to me that '"the *bars* and *length* of dayes" should be regarded as a single expression, meaning "the obstacles caused by or incident to length of time."' This seems to me the only way in which the phrase can be satisfactorily interpreted, and the italicising of *bars* and *length*, but not of dayes, may be significant. Vaughan's point is that age tends to dry up the springs of poetry, although in the exceptional case of the *Sire* it was an advantage. There would be a slight stress on 'his' in the next line.

predecessor of D'avenant in the Laureateship and the 'father' of a whole tribe of poetical sons of Ben, we have no ground for accepting his eyesight as notoriously weak.

The error has been that of considering English poets only, and of disregarding the subject of Vaughan's verses. *Gondibert* was described by its author as an heroick poem, and who is so surely the Sire of any heroick poet in the seventeenth century as Homer, the founder of the art? Homer satisfies the two conditions of the text, for tradition gave him both blindness and length of days. He was, as the compliment requires, a narrative, not a dramatic poet. And to clinch all, there is the Preface to *Gondibert* with its innumerable Homeric references. Vaughan's poem begins:

> Well, wee are rescued! and by thy rare Pen
> *Poets* shall live, when *Princes* die like men.
> Th' hast cleer'd the prospect to our harmless *Hill*,
> Of late years clouded with imputed Ill.

D'avenant opens his preface, after a dozen lines of address to Hobbs, with the words 'I will (according as all times have applied their reverence) begin with *Homer*, who...seems to me standing upon the Poets famous hill, like the eminent Sea-mark, by which they have in former Ages steer'd.' It is hardly necessary to quote further; the preface and Hobbs' *Answer* are full of Homer; even the *Post-script* alludes to him; and Vaughan was fresh from the book when he wrote.

Mr Martin has indeed noted that 'Vaughan's poem seems to repeat thoughts in the congratulatory poems by Cowley and Waller accompanying *Gondibert*. But these,' he says, 'appear to throw no light on Vaughan's meaning.' Rightly taken, they throw a good deal. Cowley and Waller, like Vaughan, single out the feature which D'avenant's preface had proclaimed noteworthy in the poem, that he, being a Christian Poet, did not need to imitate the elder poets in feeding the world with supernatural tales. D'avenant's admirers seized upon this innovation for compliment; Hobbs scoffs at those who 'would have impenetrable Armours, Inchanted Castles, Invulnerable Bodies, Iron Men, Flying Horses, and a thousand other such things, which are easily feigned by them that dare. Against such I defend you (without assenting to those that condemn either *Homer* or *Virgil*) by dissenting onely from those that think the Beauty of a Poem consisteth in the exorbitancy of the fiction.' Similarly Waller admires D'avenant's

> *matchless Book...*
> *Which no bold tales of* Gods *or* Monsters *swell,*
> *But humane Passions, such as with us dwell.*

Cowley is in the same chorus;

> *Me thinks Heroick Poesie till now,*
> *Like some fantastick Fairy-land did show;*
> *Gods, Devils, Nymphs, Witches, and Giants race,*
> *And all but Man, in Mans best work had place.*

Vaughan, with the praise of these enthusiasts before him, felt that he had something to beat; he echoed them faithfully enough in ll. 13–24 of his poem, and then, discarding Hobbs' wise reservation, he proceeded to depreciate Homer himself in comparison with Sir William D'avenant.

H. F. B. Brett-Smith.

Oxford.

REVIEWS.

The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by Sir A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. xi. The Period of the French Revolution. Cambridge: University Press. 1914. 8vo. xiv + 523 pp.

The Cambridge History of English Literature makes progress rapidly towards its conclusion. We have the eleventh volume now before us, and the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth are promised us soon, to be followed by two supplementary volumes of prose and verse extracts, with reproductions of title-pages, portraits, facsimiles and other illustrations. The whole will be a work of permanent value; indispensable for reference to every student of English Literature, and of great, though somewhat unequal merit in the field of literary appreciation and criticism. It is inevitable that in an undertaking of this kind there should be great difficulties of arrangement and organisation, and it would be idle to pretend that these difficulties have always been successfully surmounted. Above all it is impossible that a clear view can be presented of the course of English Literature and the evolution of its various elements by a series of chapters, however ably written, of which the plan for the most part is that each should deal with a separate author, and which are for the most part necessarily disconnected. The only way of obviating the disadvantages of this method would have been to prefix to each volume an introductory survey of the period which was to be dealt with in it, and to secure that each chapter should be written with some reference to this general scheme; but such an expedient did not commend itself to the editors, and we must be content with what they have actually given us.

It may well be supposed that in regard to the volume before us the difficulties of arrangement presented themselves in a peculiarly acute form. Some were perhaps inevitable, but it is none the less to be regretted that by the method of division adopted Wordsworth and Coleridge should have been cut off from the later poetry of the Romantic revival, or that Byron and Shelley, so essentially poets of the revolutionary movement, should have been shut out from the 'period of the French Revolution,' because they were not contemporary with the beginning of that period. There are other faults of the kind which might easily have been avoided, and it is certainly difficult to see why Blake and Burns should have been treated of later than

Wordsworth and Coleridge, or why the chapter on the 'Georgian Drama' should have been brought in here. One result of the present arrangement is that for Goldsmith as a dramatist we have to look back to the preceding volume, which is the proper place for the whole chapter.

The volume opens very properly with Burke, and some attempt has been made, both in this chapter and in others, to exhibit his influence as dominating this period. Professor Grierson in writing about Burke has Wordsworth in his mind, and is anxious to exhibit the relations between him and the spirit of the Romantic revival:

> His defence of prejudice is just such a recognition of the nature of moral reason as that which turned Wordsworth from Godwin's 'political justice' to the emotions and prejudices of the peasant (p. 25).

And again later it is remarked that in Burke there appears

> the same mood of mind as is manifest in Wordsworth's sense of something mysterious and divine in the life of nature and the emotions of simple men, which links the eternal process of the stars to the moral admonitions of the human heart (p. 27).

The connexion is very clearly marked, though the differences also are carefully pointed out; and so also in the chapter on Wordsworth, his work is described as an 'English variety of Rousseauism, revised and corrected, in some parts, by the opposite influence of Edmund Burke' (p. 93); and of Coleridge it is said that 'the core of his creed, as of Burke's, lay in the conviction that the civic life of man is the offspring not of deliberate calculation,...but of instincts, often working unknown to himself, which are rooted in the deepest fibres of his nature' (p. 139). Burke appears as the natural object of attack of the revolutionary pamphleteer (p. 47), and as the prophet of the authors of the *Anti-Jacobin* (p. 42).

Professor Grierson's account of Burke himself is on the whole admirable, an excellent appreciation both of his strength and of his weakness: on the one hand his fulness of mind and his immense knowledge of detail, his sense of the infinite complexity of human society and of the dangers which lay in the path of any reform which proceeded by steps less gradual than those of its historical evolution, all this combined with the love of liberty which led him to urge the claims of the American colonies, the hatred of oppression which, with all faults of taste and temper, underlay the indictment against Warren Hastings, and above all with the philosophical imagination which enabled him to picture to himself and to his hearers (or rather to his readers) the conditions of a given political problem; and on the other hand the want of faith in the essential good sense and rectitude of human nature which led him unduly to fear the issue of any political movement to which he was unaccustomed, and the limitation of view which rejected any ideal of political liberty which was not capable of being stated in terms of the British constitution. Similarly Professor Grierson does justice to his rhetorical rhythm, his 'concrete and glowing imagery,'

the nervous vigour and pregnancy of his style and the consummate skill of his quotations and literary references.

> When all is said, his is one of the greatest minds that have concerned themselves with political topics, and, alike, the substance and the form of his works have made him the only orator whose speeches have secured for themselves a permanent place in English literature beside what is greatest in our drama, our poetry and our prose (p. 32).

The minor political writers and speakers of the period are competently dealt with by Mr Previté-Orton, who however seems greatly to over-estimate the wit of the authors of the *Rolliad*. Godwin and his wife, Paine and Cobbett, are the prose writers dealt with in this chapter, and Fox, Pitt, Sheridan and Grattan are the orators. Bentham is reserved for the next chapter as the founder of Utilitarianism which is treated by Professor Sorley with his usual clearness and insight. With him are reckoned Arthur Young and Malthus, both keen observers who kept in close touch with the actual facts of human life; while the tradition of a different school was carried on by Dugald Stewart, more powerful in his personality than in his books. 'Among his numerous writings there is no single work of short compass which conveys his essential contribution to the progress of thought' (p. 76). But what was this essential contribution? Professor Sorley leaves us to search for it.

Mr Harold Child writes the chapter on Cowper. It is pleasantly enough written, but it hardly puts him exactly in his right place with reference to what had gone before and what was to come after. It is suggested that he is a precursor not only of Wordsworth but also of Meredith. Yet 'he is not a philosopher, and he is not a mystic,' and he is marked off from preceding poets of Nature chiefly by his 'simplicity and exactness in description.' He stands in fact by himself, looking backwards rather than forwards, and not properly to be regarded as the precursor of any great movement. His letters and the charming personality which is shown in them are too briefly dealt with here.

Wordsworth has been entrusted to Professor Legouis, and his name might well seem to be a sufficient guarantee of excellence. There is indeed much that is excellent, especially in the exposition of the philosophy which underlay Wordsworth's poetical work, but as regards the work itself Professor Legouis somewhat fails in appreciation. It is not merely that while calling *The Excursion* a 'noble poem,' he practically condemns it as 'a long sermon against pessimism,' in which 'Wordsworth, as the optimistic Pedlar, or Wanderer, assails Wordsworth as the Solitary, or late enthusiast of the French revolution, now dispirited.' With the judgment this suggested of *The Excursion* as a work of art we may not be disposed to quarrel. But the critic seems almost to renounce the most important part of his task when he says:

> Other characteristics ought to be added, regarding his more purely artistic gifts —gifts of verse-writing and style, gifts of composition. But this would land us in endless discussions; for in these respects, Wordsworth's mastery is surely relative and intermittent (p. 115).

Nevertheless it is upon these 'more purely artistic gifts' that his place as a poet depends, and if his mastery in these respects is intermittent, the more need is there, not indeed for endless discussions about them, but for the discernment of a true critic. Even the theory of poetical diction and its influence upon Wordsworth's work is passed over almost without comment.

The chapter on Coleridge by Professor Vaughan is on the whole admirable. Here and there perhaps it is marked by too great subtlety of suggestion, as in the interpretation of the line

> O Wordsworth! we receive but what we give,

(as a matter of fact, did not Coleridge write 'O William, etc.'?) and in the explanation of the so-called epilogue to the second part of *Christabel* (p. 127), which in fact is not an epilogue at all, but apparently a casual fragment which the poet may have intended to incorporate with the rest. Professor Vaughan is right in protesting against the current exaggeration of Coleridge's original achievement as a Shakespeare critic; his debt to Schlegel, never properly acknowledged, is surely undoubted, and his work, at least as it remains to us, is very fragmentary and uncertain, though no doubt full of brilliant suggestion. On the other hand his place in the history of philosophy seems to be over-estimated. Here again, as Professor Vaughan points out, there is a question of unacknowledged obligations, and it is surely too much to say of him that he was the founder of the modern study of experimental psychology.

An interesting account of Crabbe's work is thus summed up by Mr Child:

> He has left some vivid and beautiful passages of descriptive poetry; some admirably told tales and a long gallery of profound and lively portraits; and by the intensity of his vision, the force of his mind and his sturdy sincerity, he ploughed for future workers wide tracts which, before him, poetry had allowed to lie fallow.

This may be true, but it must be said that it was not mainly for poets that he ploughed these tracts and that after him poetry has allowed them for the most part to lie fallow, at least until our own day. His followers were not poets but novelists, as Mr Child at one point suggests, but he does not apparently countenance the opinion that Crabbe himself had better have been a writer of prose stories. It is difficult to say where he would have lost and easy to see how greatly he might have gained if prose had been his medium of expression. At present his verse repels far more than it attracts, and the power of which Mr Child speaks of catching up minute details into the dramatic mood of the moment might have been exercised in prose with even greater effect. It may be remarked that the most powerful thing that Crabbe ever wrote, the story of Peter Grimes, is not mentioned by Mr Child[1].

[1] The reference to Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* in the note on p. 143 seems to be wrongly given. It should be to Letter xxix.

Professor Saintsbury writes a rather curiously arranged chapter on Southey and the lesser poets of the later eighteenth century, Anstey, Hanbury Williams, J. Hall Stevenson, Darwin, Hayley, Bowles and others. It is pleasant to have something like an adequate appreciation of Southey, both as a poet and prose-writer. As might be expected Professor Saintsbury is especially alive to metrical characteristics, but perhaps he attributes too much to Southey in the matter of 'the ballad principle of anapæstic equivalence.' The older ballads from *Chevy Chace* downwards, in which this principle is traditional, were of course familiar to him and the natural object of his imitation. Professor Saintsbury's appreciation of the 'lesser poets' is very properly brief, but displays that wide knowledge and catholic taste which we are accustomed to expect from the author. Professor Saintsbury also deals very competently in a subsequent chapter with the 'later novel,' which means mainly the work of Amory, Beckford, Godwin, Miss Edgeworth, Mrs Radcliffe, Lewis, Maturin and Peacock. He seems to feel here, as in the chapter on Southey, that there is something wrong with the arrangement and spends some time in apologising for it; and it is certainly difficult to see why Horace Walpole, Clara Reeve and Miss Burney should have been assigned to the preceding volume, or why Peacock should be admitted to this. When he reviews the prosody of the eighteenth century, he is in his element, but he deals more with prosodists than with poets. For some reason he reserves for future treatment many of the most important eighteenth century developments, those of Blake and Chatterton for example; and he makes no mention of Burns.

Blake is admirably dealt with by Mr J. P. R. Wallis, and this chapter is especially valuable for the appreciation which is attempted of the whole work of the poet and prophet and of its relation to that of Wordsworth and Shelley. The lyrical poetry and the prophetic books have hitherto been too often separated, and the manner in which the philosophy which underlay the whole is here traced out is worthy of the Liverpool school of Blake-study to which Dr Sampson's work also belongs.

Mr Henderson deals with Burns and the lesser Scottish verse of the latter part of the eighteenth century, and as may be supposed shows both wide knowledge and sound appreciation. Especially valuable is the tracing of the history of Burns's metrical forms. Mr Henderson expresses a natural regret, that the last nine years of the poet's life 'were, apart from songs, almost a poetic blank.' The exception, however, is a very large one, and we fully share the regret only on the supposition that he might have done much more without loss of the songs, a supposition which is reasonable perhaps in view of the extent to which he utilised the older materials, as illustrated by Mr Henderson's analysis.

Mr Routh's chapter on 'the Georgian drama' contains some rather questionable matter. We doubt whether the expansion of the British empire and the 'virile and energetic governing class' which it called

into existence had much to do with the atmosphere of Sheridan's plays, which hardly differs in any essential point from that of the so-called Restoration comedy, and the elaborate account which the critic gives of the conceptions underlying the *School for Scandal* does not in the least convince us. Apart, however, from this tendency to theorise rather loosely, which is exhibited especially in the concluding remarks about the Drama and Realism, Mr Routh's account is fairly satisfactory, though maimed by the omission of Goldsmith, whose dramatic work has been dealt with earlier. We may incidentally observe that it was not actors that were ridiculed in the *Rehearsal*, that *A Simple Story* cannot properly be called a powerful novel, and that the story of Inkle and Yarico was told by Steele and not by Addison.

The three remaining chapters have each a special interest of its own. Mr Aldis writes another interesting and admirable chapter on 'Book production and distribution' in continuation of that on the Book-trade published in the fourth volume, this time covering the period 1625–1800; Mrs Aldis contributes a chapter on 'the Bluestockings' and the development of education and literary culture among women, which brings together much that is of interest with regard to the conversation-circles organised by Mrs Vesey and Mrs Montague and frequented by such ladies as Elizabeth Carter, Hannah More, Mrs Chapone and Fanny Burney, as well as by men like Benjamin Stillingfleet (whose 'blue' or plain worsted stockings gave the popular name to the assemblies), Horace Walpole, Bennet Langton and others. Finally we have a chapter on children's books covering the whole of modern English literature by Mr Harvey Darton, whose connexion with the firm of Darton and Harvey, one of the foremost of those that have been engaged in the publication of children's books, makes him specially qualified to deal with this topic. He gives very interesting information with regard to the production and circulation of such books, and especially the methods adopted in illustrating them.

The Bibliographies are to a larger extent than before compiled by experts, other than the authors of the corresponding chapters, and especially by Mr A. T. Bartholomew and Mr G. A. Brown. Those relating to chapters I, II, VI (for the most part) are by the first named, and those on chapters IV, V, XI by the second, while both have worked together on chapters VIII and XIII. They are of their accustomed excellence and, like those in previous volumes, furnish guidance to the student which cannot elsewhere be found.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap. Vol. v. Published by Nyfilologiska Sällskapet i Stockholm. Uppsala. 1914. 8vo. xxxix + 252 pp.

The contents of this issue are as follows:

(1) Geijer, P. A. *Carl Wahlund*, p. vii.
(2) Zachrisson, R. E. *Two instances of French influence on English place-names*, p. 1.
(3) Zachrisson, R. E. *Shakespeares uttal*, p. 25.
(4) Malmstedt, A. *Om Swinburnes liv och diktning*, p. 45.
(5) Geijer, P. A. *Lingvistiska kåserier*, p. 87.
(6) Staaff, E. *Le développement phonétique de* -abilis *et* -ibilis *en français*, p. 115.
(7) Ekblom, R. *Buregi-Byringe*, p. 131.
(8) Reinius, Josef. *A few miscellaneous notes on English pronouns*, p. 137.
(9) Berg, Ruben G:son. *Bidrag till attraktionsläran*, p. 147.
(10) Munthe, Åke W:son. *Strödda anteckningar om uttrycket 'myror i huvudet' och några närstående bilder*, p. 159.
(11) Kjellman, Hilding. *Une version anglo-normande inéditée du Miracle de S. Théophile*, p. 183. Avec une appendice: *Le miracle de la femme enceinte retirée de la mer par la sainte vierge*, p. 215.
(12) Kjellman, H. and Lindkvist, H. *Aperçu bibliographique des ouvrages de philologie romane et germanique publiés par des Suédois de* 1908 *à* 1912, pp. 229—252.

The 'Society of Modern Philology' at Upsala issues from time to time attractive volumes of studies on modern literary or linguistic subjects. The present volume is the fifth in order and appears under the able editorship of the Committee of the Society and of Professor E. Staaff. It is introduced by a sympathetic memoir of the well-known and well-loved Romance philologist of Upsala, Professor Carl Wahlund, by his life-long friend, Professor P. A. Geijer.

The papers then follow. Prof. Geijer contributes two interesting discussions in Swedish on (1) 'The French *que* used to introduce various kinds of subordinate clauses,' and (2) 'Different varieties of the analysis of language,' with a doctoral thesis by C. Svedelius, 'L'analyse du langage appliquée à la langue française,' 1897, as a starting-point.

Professor E. Staaff, the present occupant of the Chair of Romance at Upsala, writes in French on the phonetic development in that language of the suffixes *-abilis* and *-ibilis*.

Dr H. Kjellman publishes a little-known Anglo-Norman text of the *Miracle of St Theophilus* from MS. Reg. 20, B. XIV in the British Museum, belonging to the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century, and as an appendix 'Le miracle de la femme enceinte,' also with distinct Anglo-Norman dialect features.

These able and interesting papers form the Romance element of the volume.

Dr Ruben G:son Berg, well-known as a keen and critical observer of syntactical and other phenomena in Modern Swedish, adds in his paper (pp. 149—151) to the cases already collected by him of grammatical attraction in Swedish, cases which show like the proverbial straw in the current the tendency to weakening of the feeling for inflexion in that language.

Dr Munthe brings a wealth of material to illustrate the origin, history, and analogues of the Swedish idiom *myror i hufudet* 'ants in one's head,' and finally concludes that in all likelihood it must have been modelled on the German phrase 'Mücken im Kopf' (pp. 158—181).

R. Ekblom connects the Russian place-name *Buregi-Buriagi* (about 45 km. from Novgorod) with the Swedish patronymic *Buringr* and the place-name *Byringe* in the Swedish province of Södermanland. He compares *Varegi* and *Kolbegi* in the same district with the Scandinavian forms *vāring(r)* and *kylfing(r)* (pp. 131—135).

A. Malmstedt's sympathetic and charmingly written study of 'Swinburne's life and lyrical poetry' can unfortunately only be enjoyed by those who know Swedish.

J. Reinius, however, contributes notes in English on the use of the pronouns *which* and *what*.

Finally, Dr Zachrisson has sent in two contributions of high interest. The first of these, *Two instances of French influence on English place-names*, was originally intended to be included in the second part of his excellent and by now well-known book on *Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-names*, 1909.

The first instance investigated by Zachrisson is the loss of *t* and *d* (*a*) in the medial position, e.g. *Tingewick* (Bu.) < O.E. *Tidingawic, *Taynton* (Gl.) < O.E. *Taetingatun, *Doynton* (Gl.) < O.E. *Duddingatun, *Dyddingatun. *Tindon* or *Tittington* (Ke.) < O.E. *Tyttingatun, *Toynton* (Li.) < O.E. *Tyttingatun, *Tuttingatun, *Bainton* (Np.) < O.E. *Ba(æ)-dingatun, *Snainton* (No.) < O.E. Snotingatun, where the French form has prevailed, and in early forms of *Snodland* (Ke.) < O.E. *Snoddingaland, *Thedingworth* (Li.) < O.E. *Þeodingaweorþ, *Trotton* (Ss.) < O.E. *Tratingatun (?), *Frodingham* (Yo.) probably < O.E. *Frodingaham; also in *Lydiate* (La.) < O.E. hlydgeat 'turnstile,' *Witham* (Es.) < O.E. Witanham where the French form has not been retained in modern pronunciation: (*b*) in positions before *l* and *r*, e.g. *Potheridge* (Dv.) < O.E. Puda or Podda, *Studland* (Do.) < O.E. stōd + land, etc.

In the examples under (*a*) Zachrisson maintains that the loss of the intervocalic *t*, *d* cannot be due to English sound-development, since even in modern dialects these sounds are regularly kept between two vowels[1]. Nor are these forms confined to any one dialect, but occur sporadically in various parts of England or stand side by side with the full forms in the same early record. He believes that this loss of *t*, *d* must be due to French influence, and to an influence which was ortho-

[1] This is not strictly true, since intervocalic *t*, esp. with *l* or *r* in next syllable, has been replaced by the glottal stop in certain Scotch dialects and in London.

graphical rather than phonological. In Norman words of this type *t* and *d* were still retained in the spelling though lost in pronunciation, e.g. *Totteneium, Todiniacum, Toeny* = Tosny (Eure). A corresponding English form like *Tatinton* was looked upon by the Norman as a traditional spelling and pronounced and sometimes written without the *t*. Consequently *Taynton* (Gl.) and similar forms 'owe their *origin* merely to the spelling, their ultimate *victory* is due to the combined influence of French spelling and French pronunciation.' Another possible though not so probable explanation suggested by Zachrisson is 'that in the case of loan-words old sound-laws repeat themselves,' and that consequently in these cases $t > d > (\delta) > 0$ analogically, the unusual *Tating-* being replaced by the more familiar one of *Tain-*.

Loss of *t* and *d* before *l* or *r* in early forms of *Potheridge*, etc., Zachrisson also ascribes to French transformation, the combinations *tl, dl, tr, dr* not occurring in French, except in learned words.

On pp. 19—21 omission or addition of *r* in early instances of English place-names is discussed and explained as due to Anglo-Norman influence, graphic or otherwise.

Zachrisson's second article touches on such a vital matter as the pronunciation of Shakespeare. It is, unfortunately for English readers, written in Swedish, but since this short paper is based on a strikingly important work by the same author, *Pronunciation of English Vowels 1400 to 1700*, which, one may almost say, puts the whole matter of English sound-development on a new footing, students cannot do better than refer to this latter book for information.

A. C. Paues.

Cambridge.

Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries. Edited by F. E. Harmer. Cambridge: University Press. 1914. 8vo. x + 142 pp.

In his preface to Miss Harmer's book Professor Chadwick calls attention to the need, emphasised years ago by the late Professor Maitland, of a satisfactory edition of the Anglo-Saxon charters. In the absence of a complete corpus we must welcome carefully prepared editions of select charters such as Napier and Stevenson's *Crawford Charters* and the book under notice. To edit these charters adequately requires a very considerable knowledge of Anglo-Saxon language, institutions and history, and a comparison of Miss Harmer's work with its well-known predecessor shows that the standard set is worthily maintained. The book contains twenty-three old English documents ranging from the beginning of the ninth to the end of the tenth century and comprising grants, deeds, wills and other instruments. A modern English version follows, then detailed illustrative and explanatory notes, and lastly a short appendix on dialect. All the documents in this selection have been printed before, some of them edited with

explanatory notes; but Miss Harmer by her industry, learning and good judgment has thrown fresh light on many of the difficulties as well as corrected errors of previous editors. In a number of instances place-names are identified for the first time; and words are explained which are not to be found in Bosworth-Toller's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Dates are fixed more precisely than before, and measures, coins and usages come in for discussion. One or two points of detail may be noted. On p. 36, line 5, the MS. reading *ymbweson* is translated as if it were *ymbwæron*, the sentence *ðas feowero miδ Gode ymbweson ðas boc* being translated 'these four have, with God's help, been engaged upon this book.' But as *ymbweson* is obviously the infinitive, we should remove the colon after *peccatorem* and translate 'remember that ...were engaged upon this book.' On the same page, l. 12, we might put a comma after *svlfre* and translate *ofgylded faconleas feh* 'a perfect possession all gilded over.' With the expression *faconleas feh* compare *mid uncre clæne feo* on p. 12, l. 19. Lower down the page, l. 14, the word *gihamadi* may = *gehāmette* 'domiciled.' The priest Aldred, who is clearly the writer of the entries in the Gospels, has quite definite, almost business-like, aims in making the glosses. By the word *inlade* he refers to his entry into the monastery, so that Miss Harmer, following Sir E. Maunde Thompson, rightly translates *gihamadi* 'obtained for himself a home'; i.e. proved himself worthy of admission to the community. In Earl Ælfred's will the phrase *allum his weotum* 7 *geweotan* is translated 'to all his councillors and advisers.' Miss Harmer remarks that *geweotan* is probably of wider signification than *weotan*. Does it not rather mean the 'fellow-councillors' of the earl? In the note on p. 71, l. 6, the words 'for the second time' should be added after 'decreed,' as the synod of Acleah had already in the year 810 decreed that Oswulf's will should stand. On p. 9, l. 22, the phrase *fram þan halgan were* is translated 'from the company of the holy (?).' Miss Harmer compares North. *halgawaras, haligwaras* 'holy people.' We may note that B.-T. cite two instances of a substantive *wer* or *were*, which means 'guard,' 'troop,' 'band.' On p. 101, note on l. 32, read *þas* for *as*. On p. 35, l. 24, we suggest, with a good deal of hesitation, *læt* for the MS. reading *lit*. B.-T. cite one instance of *læt*, which means 'one of a class that was inferior to that of the ceorl and above that of the slave.' The adoption of *læt* would confirm Miss Harmer's emendation of *in bynde* into *inbyrde*, used of a serf born in his master's house or estate. The phrase *hwonne habbe we ðonne gemotad* on p. 31, l. 32, is translated 'when shall we be done with negotiating'; we prefer to render 'when shall we reach a definite result of discussion,' i.e. a binding judgment or decision.

Miss Harmer is to be congratulated on doing a valuable piece of work in a neglected field, and we hope she will undertake to edit a further selection of charters at no distant date.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

Gnomic Poetry in Anglo-Saxon. By BLANCHE COLTON WILLIAMS. New York: Columbia University Press. 1914. 12mo. xiv + 171 pp.

Besides an annotated reprint of the Gnomic Verses of the Exeter Book and the Cotton MS. prepared from the manuscripts, Dr Williams includes in this attractive little volume a detailed discussion of the sententious sayings which are so conspicuous in early Old English literature. She attempts to trace their gradual decadence as the Anglo-Saxon period declined, brings together the most prominent examples, and from them draws inferences regarding Teutonic life and thought. Her purpose thus requires the application of the familiar and hazardous 'scientific' method of criticism. The so-called gnomic passages must be detached from their epic or lyric context. The separation is in this case possible, since the gnome is capable of fairly clear definition, and in Old English is commonly marked by recurring words and peculiar constructions. Dr Williams's careful work does not lead to any important new conclusions, but it adds new detail to current knowledge.

An interesting conclusion to the introduction is furnished by the author's modification of the views of Müllenhoff and Mogk with regard to those obscure functionaries called in Old Norse *þulir* (wise men). Müllenhoff, who was first to give them serious consideration, ascribes to them all the old lays of the North. Mogk finds little difference between the Skalds and the *þulir*. Miss Williams compares them with the O.E. *þyle* defined by Bosworth-Toller as 'orator, statesman.'

After examining references to him in Old English literature, she suggests that the Northern *þulr* (O.E. *þyle*) was a professional entertainer who 'spoke lines befitting the ancient greybeard, and mimicked an all-wise dwarf.' That is very probable. It by no means follows, however, that 'the beginnings of mythologic and gnomic poetry may have arisen from the circle of' the *þulir*. Indeed such an inference is unwarranted for reasons given by the critic herself in other parts of her book.

The second part of the study is devoted to the detailed consideration of the Exeter and Cotton Gnomes. There is no material addition to what has been already said upon the subject by Brandl and others. A text with notes and glossary is added. I offer the following revisions of notes which strike me as awkward or inaccurate.

ll. 29 f. *Meotud āna wāt*
hwǣr sē cwealm cymeþ, þe heonan of cȳþþe gewīteþ.

The editor reads: 'The Creator alone knows *whence* the malady comes which hence from the country goes.' But surely *hwǣr* is here a conjunction: 'The Creator alone knows the man who will die, (in the places) where disease will come.'

ll. 108 f. *Cēap ēadig mon, cyning wīc þonne*
lēodon cȳpeþ, þonne līþan cymeð.

The note says: 'Confusing lines. The meaning seems to be something like this: His property a wealthy man, the king a dwelling will sell, to the sailor when he comes sailing.' But by taking *cēapēadig* as a compound (='prosperous'), and joining also *cyning-wīc* (='stately dwelling'), we obtain an intelligible construction: 'The prosperous merchant then buys a stately dwelling for his people, when he comes sailing home.'

P. D. Haworth.

Bristol.

Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose. By Dean Spruill Fansler. New York: Columbia Univ. Press; London: H. Milford. 1914. 8vo. 269 pp.

Many people are fond of drawing comparisons between American methods of education and our own, one of the most striking features of the American system being post-graduate research work, which usually results in a thesis, or more than one thesis, since in this case it is certainly true that appetite comes with eating. America is rapidly becoming the home of the monograph. Much careful and scholarly work is being done within certain rather narrow limits, and if the greater part of such work shows diligence rather than any brilliant originality, still the ordered marshalling of facts is in itself a useful and valuable contribution to the literature of a subject. Dr Fansler's study of Chaucer's debt to the *Roman de la Rose* is detailed and careful. A large number of authorities have been consulted, and the original texts have been worked through line by line. The appendices contain tables showing the exact differences in numbering between Meon's, Michel's, and Martan's version of the Romance (a most desirable adjunct), and there is also a bibliography which, as its author modestly states, is serviceable without professing to be exhaustive.

The monograph itself shows a sense of proportion not always to be found in the productions of specialists. Too often those who seek, find, and the most chance or obvious resemblance between two poets is taken as definite proof of plagiary, or at least of direct and conscious influence. Dr Fansler uses 'no suche knakkes smale.' His object is to show what parts of the *Roman de la Rose* most appealed to Chaucer, and how he bettered his borrowings—not simply to note parallel passages, many of which have been noted before. When he finds Pandarus exclaiming

O Furies three of helle, on yow I crye,

he is content to remark: 'As hell was the regular abiding place of the Furies there is no object in hunting for the source of this line.' At the same time he draws attention to a very large number of parallels, some of which have escaped the notice of previous investigators. Perhaps the most interesting, and certainly the most disputable part of the

book is that discussing the influence of the *Roman* upon Chaucer's character-drawing. In all cases of 'influence' much must necessarily depend upon the point of view of the individual critic, but it is difficult not to feel that in some instances Dr Fansler is here at least skirting the very pit which he avoids so carefully in dealing with verbal resemblances. Cressida's fear of what people will say of her is so essential and natural a trait in her character that it seems unnecessary to derive it from the villain Male-Bouche. The whole point of the story of Cressid lies in the fact that she is no heartless adventuress, but a very winning and attractive person, part of whose charm springs from her reluctance to do anything which people will dislike. Pandarus and Reason, it is true, both laugh at their 'charges' and quote proverbs. There is, of course, a possible thread of connection in this fact, but it is a thin one. Satires on the clergy had accused them of gluttony and immorality long before the days of Jean de Meung, and continued to do so for many hundreds of years. There are certain points of resemblance between the Monks of Cokayne, the 'Freres and Faitours' of *Piers Plowman*, and the Pardoners of Chaucer, Heywood, and Lindsay—to say nothing of Parson Trulliber or the Rev. Dr Folliott—but it seems unnecessary to derive them all from one common ancestor. In every age there are conventional ways of looking at things: in the fourteenth century a heroine must necessarily have eyes gray as glass, yellow hair, and a nose high and straight, and an ecclesiastic was likely to be represented either as a pious hermit or else as a worldly and hypocritical self-seeker. The same catch phrases appear again and again. It is interesting to note this common stock-in-trade and to see how genius contrives to fashion it into something new and living, and we owe a debt to the patient scholars who have traced line by line resemblances great and small between False-Semblant and Chaucer's Pardoner, La Vieille and the Wife of Bath, and so on and so on. But we need to remember that verbal echoes do not necessarily imply active influence. Perhaps the fact that La Vieille can be described as a 'somewhat morose and broken-spirited old woman entirely out of sympathy with life' should effectually protect even the hasty reader from all danger of carrying at least one such resemblance too far.

One point stands out conspicuously. Almost every comparison, whether of verbal resemblance or characterisation, serves to illustrate Chaucer's gift of condensation.

> Nous fist deus estre en une char;
> Et quant nous n'avons char fors une,
> Par le droit de la loi commune,
> N'il ne puet en un char estre
> Fors que une cuers a la senestre,

gains point and a characteristic flavour of irony by being compressed into the Merchant's dry

> O flesh they been and o flesh, as I gesse,
> Hath but on herte in wele and in distresse.

The book is one which all students of the literature of the fourteenth century will find useful. It is suggestive and scholarly, and presents information which might easily appear dull or pedantic in attractive form. The reader can please himself as regards the importance to be attached to this or that similarity of diction or thought, but the mere fact that his attention has been called to it is of itself valuable, and there is much in this concise volume to stimulate further research.

GRACE E. HADOW.

CIRENCESTER.

Place-names of England and Wales. By The Rev. J. B. JOHNSTON. London: John Murray. 1915. 8vo. vi + 532 pp.

This volume, by the author of *Place-names of Scotland*, is an attempt to deal with the history of all town and village-names found in the Postal Guide and with a certain number of names of natural features as well. It is the work of one who is an enthusiast for his subject and who has devoted the leisure hours of some twenty years to the completion of it. One would fain give a cordial welcome to the fruits of such enthusiasm and such toil, but unfortunately the book suffers from certain radical faults which make it entirely unworthy to stand by the side of many books, smaller in compass, but more scholarly in method. These faults are summarily as follows:

(1) The author gives a certain number of old forms of a place-name, seldom more than three, often only one, and then proceeds to etymologise. As a matter of fact, isolated M.E. forms, owing to the vagaries of M.E. spelling, are often worse than useless, and no attempt should be made to solve the history of a name until a complete list of forms from early to modern times has been compiled. Further, in spite of his own oft-repeated warning against the folly of so doing, Mr Johnston often etymologises with no old forms at all to go upon.

(2) He fails to use much of the excellent work already done by other writers. The author might not always agree with their conclusions, but again and again they offer evidence which is conclusive against his own view. Thus, Lindkvist's *M.E. Place-names of Scandinavian Origin* should have been consulted for Ainderby, Aysgarth, Bassenthwaite, Hoby, Huby, Nafferton, Staindrop; reference to the forms given by Moorman would have thrown a very different light on Almondbury, Denaby, Fewston, Leathley, Rawdon, Rawmarsh and Rothwell in the West Riding. Zachrisson's *Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-names* would have explained Messing. Mutschmann should have been quoted for Blidworth, Bonnington, Caunton, Chilwell (Notts.), Skeat for Baylham and Combs (Suff.).

(3) The phonology is inaccurate and unscientific, e.g. (p. 92): 'the *ch* in *Dom.* is the habitual softening of the Norman scribes'; (p. 341)

s.n. *Leek*: 'The forms in Oxf. Dict. *s.v. lea* sb. do not encourage us to call them hardened forms of O.E. *léah*, meadow'; (p. 369) s.n. *Midgley*: 'The *dg* is palatalised *c*'; (p. 440) s.n. *Shide*: '*Dom.* side. Prob. aspirated form of O.E. *síde*,' and innumerable cases of mistakes in individual names might be quoted.

(4) Searle's *Onomasticon* is used without any consideration as to whether the names given there are O.E. at all, and no attempt is made to identify the corrupt forms quoted there from Domesday and other late documents. Andhere, Andahari (94), Bago (122), Berchthart (129), Isgod, Ishere, Iswulf (243), Isenbard, Isengrim (321), Vadipert (408), Hrambertus (415), are purely continental name-forms. The form Bascic (162) is a corruption of Bacgsecg, O.E. Tirweald is not the same as Thorold (115), Asser (115, 119) is either O.N. or Welsh, not O.E., the name Osecg from William of Malmesbury is a ghost-form.

(5) The O.E. and O.N. are often at fault. Thus it is certain that no *-r* suffix of the nom. sg. could have survived in names borrowed from the Scandinavian, as is frequently here asserted. The statement is made that 'Rathmell, *Dom.* Rodemele, contains O.E. *ród*, with the North. *á*' and a form *Ropleah* in a charter of 972 is connected with O.E. *ráp*. Many mistakes are made in quoting O.E. forms, e.g. Ae*l*flet-ee (*Chron.* 762 E), Hreopodune (*Chron.* 874), Sel*un*du (Asser), and meanings are given which rest on mistranslations, e.g. O.E. *dun-geat* is rendered 'hill of the gate,' Edgeware from O.E. Ecgeswer, 'at the edge of the weir,' Hauxley, earlier Hafodescelfe, 'top of the hill.' Harome is taken to be O.E. *hārum*, dat. pl. of *hār*, boundary, though there is no evidence that this word was ever used as a noun.

(6) Strange meanings are suggested with no attempt to account for them, e.g. it is said that O.E. *amber*, 'pitcher,' is found in Ambergate, Amberley, and Amplefirth; Arkendale is 'valley of the arks or chests,' Arkesdon 'wooded valley of the chest,' and Arksey 'isle of the chest'; Banwell is O.E. *bána-wæl* (*sic*) 'pool of the bones'; Diss is O.E. *deis* 'high table.'

(7) Random suggestions are thrown out only to be abandoned, and no clear issue is presented. The following etymology is characteristic:

> Glaston. Not in *Dom. a.* 1100 grant of 664, *Glathestun*. There is no name like *Glathe* in *Onom.* though there is a *Glædwis*. So this may be 'town of gladness,' O.E. *glæd*, 4 *glathe*, but prob. not. Gleadthorpe (Notts.), *Dom.* Gletorp, 1278 Gledetorp, must have the same origin.

The book is misleading for the general public and can only be of occasional service to the scholar. In the present condition of place-name study the task which its author undertook was one which could not be satisfactorily fulfilled by any one man even in the leisure hours of twenty years. Such a book may perhaps be written with success some thirty years hence, when a whole generation of scholars have worked at the subject.

Allen Mawer.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Jacke Jugeler. Edited with Introduction and Notes by W. H. Williams. Cambridge: The University Press. 1914. 4to. xxii + 75 pp.

Jacke Jugeler, apart from its interest as being probably the earliest English adaptation of a play of Plautus, is in itself a delightful farce, and it is here given to us in a form which does equal credit to its editor and to the Cambridge University Press.

Professor Williams' Introduction contains much excellent matter in little space. His text, as he tells us, is taken from the unique original by Copland (1562) in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire (by this time in America ?): but he also gives us a fragment (preserved in the Duke's copy) of another edition which from its spelling is clearly later.

The date of composition is more than ten years earlier than 1562, if, as Professor Williams gives us strong reason for believing, *Jack Jugeler* like *Ralph Roister Doister* was written by Udall. This theory was first advanced by Professor W. Bang of Louvain, who is at this moment hidden from us by the clouds of war, but whose services to English literature will never be forgotten by Englishmen, least of all by those who have known him or corresponded with him.

If Udall wrote *Jack Jugeler*—and Professor Williams supports his case by a number of phrases common to this play and to Udall's other writings as well as by the general resemblance of this play to *Ralph Roister Doister* (such resemblance as may exist between a slight sketch and a finished work)—then, as is shown, we cannot but see in the epilogue a clear reference to the unsavoury proceedings which caused Udall in 1542 to be dismissed from the Headmastership of Eton. Professor Williams inclines to believe that Udall was the victim of a plot, and was made to confess to crimes of which he was not guilty. Whether this be so or not, the Epilogue in the new light of its authorship is an extremely interesting personal document.

The list of 'Irregular, Doubtful and Erroneous Readings' (apparently an imitation of those in the Malone Society's Reprints) might perhaps have included: 2 quemues | 18 tried [tired ?] | 490 Ja jugler (misplaced) | 522 we can (I can ?) | 736 knew (know ?) | 914 That (omit ?) | 914 Careawayne (Careawaye ?) | 915 That (omit ?) | 918 beat me (beaten ?) | 1012 ye hath (y^{e} hath ?) | 1017 han (had ?).

To turn to Professor Williams' notes:

l. 65 *the first scentence.* Some elucidation was required.

l. 108 *god before.* The phrase, as seen by the examples, is '*and* god before,' which was perhaps worth noting.

l. 135 *wellbecommed.* The form deserved a note.

l. 159 *at all.* As in some other cases, the editor illustrates, but does not explain this phrase.

l. 231 *wardelith.* The editor is no doubt right in considering this a misprint for 'warbelith.' The word does not however, I think, bear its usual sense = 'quaver, shake with the voice' (French *gringoter, grin-*

gotter), but means 'shake or sway the body in walking.' My friend Mr Walter Worrall of the Oxford Dictionary confirms me in this view, and kindly sends me the following illustrations of this sense from the materials collected for the Dictionary:

(1) In the *Book of St Albans* (1486) a hawk 'warbellith her wynges' (also simply, 'warbbelyth') = she draws her wings together over her back.

(2) Stanbridge, *Vocabula* (W. de Word 1510) D. iv.: '*vibro*, to warble.'

(3) W. Thomas, *Ital. Dict.* (ed. 1567): '*Vibrare*, to shake or warble, as to shake a sword against the sunne.'

These instances support a transitive use of the word, so that it is possible that l. 232 is the object of 'warbelith.' Or the word may here be used intransitively.

l. 258 *bysye*. I have suggested elsewhere (vol. x, p. 375) that this is a corruption of 'by 's ye' (by his eye).

l. 317 *saint Gorge ye boroue*. The editor says, 'i.e. St George [be] the surety.' I incline to think that 'ye' is not the article, but = 'thee,' and that the word 'borowe' in the phrase 'to borowe' came to be considered a verb.

ll. 406, 407 *them...them*.... To whom do these pronouns refer? If to the people by whom Jack Jugler said he had been commanded, is 'yr' (their) a mistake for 'ye'?

l. 553 *payne of shame* (='on pain of shame'). There is no note.

l. 595 *to me*. This may be right, but I suspect we should read 'home.'

l. 674 *My witte is breched in such a brake*. 'Brake' may perhaps here mean 'the stocks,' as the editor says. Neither however of the two examples alleged in support is satisfactory, as a man neither stands in the stocks nor falls into the stocks. In these the word seems simply to mean 'snare.'

l. 837 *and a wyse ladde*. Query 'and [lyke] a wise ladde.'

l. 840 *flye as fast as bere in a cage*. Mr Williams writes: 'In the *Ancren Riwle*, p. 198, the bear is the type of sloth,' and our own judgment would tell us that a bear in a cage would not fly very swiftly. Why then should Careawaie, wishing to stand well with his master, compare himself to the bear?

I think the phrase is analogous to phrases with 'round' in which 'round' is used in a double sense. I imagine that the original use would be 'He kept him as fast as bear in a cage,' and that, when the latter phrase was established, by a play on the other meaning of 'fast,' it was humorously applied to verbs of motion. This seems to be the case with 'round' in phrases like 'goe as rounde as a top to the pound' (Greene, *Pinner of Wakefield*, II, 3, 418), 'to Bocardo goeth he as rounde as a ball' (P. Stubbes, *Anatomie of Abuses*, reprint 1836, p. 140), 'Ile carrie him to the feast, as rounde as a Julers boxe' (*Club Law* l. 623), 'This...fire...to the Stage howse did remove As round as taylors clewe' (*Ballad on the burning of the Globe Theatre* 1613, printed [? by

Collier] in *Gentleman's Magazine* Feb. 1816). This phrase seems to me the chief ground for thinking the ballad to be anything more than a forgery.

l. 904 *Thou shalt haue by therfore.* The editor gives a choice of corrections here: 'Thou shalt aby therfore' and 'Thou shalt have why therfore.' A third is also possible: 'Thou shalt haue wherfore.'

l. 968 *waister.* The sense 'waster' or 'cudgel' is indeed possible, but I incline to think with Hazlitt and Grosart that the word should be 'maister.'

If these criticisms appear meticulous, it is because Professor Williams' Notes are generally so useful and illuminating that only small holes can be picked in them. They give not only abundant illustrations of words and phrases from contemporary Elizabethan literature, but a long list of the Plautine phrases which the schoolmaster-author has translated, or imitated, from the *Amphitruo.* The record of the extraordinary readings given in the editions of Hazlitt and Grosart is a final proof of the superiority of Professor Williams' text to those that have hitherto held the field: and it can honestly be said that no more scholarly or interesting edition of an Elizabethan play has ever been produced.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

The 'Act-Time' in Elizabethan Theatres. By Thornton Shirley Graves. Studies in Philology. Vol. xii, No. 3. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1915.

Despite a few blemishes in the nature of argumentative surplusage, Dr Graves' illuminative study takes rank as the final pronouncement on the vexed question of 'alternation.' It is little to the credit of the considerable body of Elizabethan investigators that this should have been so tardy in coming. German in its origin and mainly German in its bolstering, the alternation theory betrays the one weak spot in German scholarship—its woeful lack of imaginative insight, its failure to grasp that the essence of all romance is freedom, and, most of all, of Elizabethan romance. Kilian, Brodmeier and Brandl ask us to believe that the work-a-day dramatists of the Shakespearian era, whose natural instincts revolted against the imposition of Aristotelian and quasi-Aristotelian precepts and caused them to create a unique plastic stage, would have adopted a self-imposed scheme of dramaturgy equally rigorous with that which claimed pseudo-classic authority and only a degree or so less hampering. It is needless to labour the absurdity of this attitude.

One of the postulates of the alternation theory, based on the arguable limitation of time caused by the necessity of acting in the afternoon by natural light, is the correlative theory of continuous

performance. Against this insecure position Dr Graves directs all the batteries of a ripe erudition, and (not without some superfluous expenditure of powder and shot) finally succeeds in dislodging its holders. It is perhaps in the nature of things that he should occasionally strive to prove too much; for, after all, it is the stream that overflows its banks that irrigates the soil. To establish act-breaks as a ruling principle of Elizabethan drama—and by breaks one implies something more than mere nominal act-divisions—only one kind of argument is really valid. You must demonstrate the employment at varying periods and at both public and private theatres of either extrinsic inter-act music or extrinsic dance and song. In accomplishing this Dr Graves overthrows the alternation theory. But he commits an error in tactics in striving to press into service inter-act dumb shows and choral emergencies, devices which, although clearly marking act-divisions, argue by their binding qualities of continuous performance. On the other hand, one important item of evidence for the later period Dr Graves has not advanced. It is presented by the prompt copy from which Massinger's long-lost Globe-and-Blackfriars tragedy, *Believe as You List*, was printed. In this advance marginal warnings to call players occur throughout, generally from forty to fifty lines ahead. But as these warnings are never given in connection with players who appear at the beginning of an act we can only assume that their absence is due to the employment of act-intervals. Moreover, this deduction is confirmed by such directions in the same prompt copy as 'Exeunt, the ende of ye Second Act,' 'The end of the Thirde Act.'

Not all the cardinal points of the alternation theory are of equal or any vulnerability, and in assailing the fundamental postulate of the theory, viz. that the duration of performances at the public theatres was strictly limited to a period between two and three hours, Dr Graves has clearly over-reached himself. While denying that there was any imperative reason for rapidity of performance or limitation of time he admits that the period of acting was comprised between dinner-time and supper-time. This is of itself a considerable limitation. William Harrison, in his *Description of England* (1587), writes: 'With us the nobility, gentry and students do ordinarily go to dinner at eleven before noon, and to supper at five or between five and six at afternoon. The merchants dine and sup seldom before twelve at noon, and six at night, especially in London.' Assuming that all sections of the public went to the play and remembering the comparative inaccessibility of the public theatres, north and south, the performance cannot have begun before two o'clock and must have concluded by five. It may be that on dark winter days the fading light was supplemented by some artificial illuminant, as Dr Graves surmises, but even then the approaching supper-hour would form a check to leisurely performance. To assume otherwise is to mis-read the old English temperament. Had the play-time not been strictly limited at all theatres, both public and private, by outer circumstances, assuredly there would have been fewer complaints from dramatists of the cutting and slashing of their

plays. Webster in his address to the reader prefixed to *The Dutchess of Malfy* draws attention to the fact that the printed play contains passages 'that, the length of the play would not beare in the Presentment.' There are similar notifications in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 and at the end of Brome's comedy of *The Antipodes*. Probably *Hamlet* and other long plays were rarely, if ever, acted as printed. The conclusion derivable from this evidence is, not that performances were continuous, but that act-intervals were, as a rule, brief. Certain methods of construction substantiate this. There is the example from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* where the lovers lying on the stage remain in mimic slumber throughout the interval. So, too, in *The Captives* a 'greate Tempestuous storme,' with frequent thunder and lightning begins at the opening of Act I, 3 and lasts to Act II, 2. One cannot reconcile this method with any system of long intervals. It either argues of brief breaks or semi-continuous performance.

As against these flaws Dr Graves' study has many counter-balancing merits. His explanation of the absence of act-divisions in the early quartos is ingenious and plausible; and he advances his arguments with a wealth of unhackneyed illustration indicative of the widest reading. It is to be hoped that he will render his conclusive paper more readily accessible to the student by reprinting it in book-form, together with a selection of his other valuable contributions to the various Journals of English philology.

W. J. Lawrence.

Dublin.

Some Textual Difficulties in Shakespeare. By Charles D. Stewart. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1914. 8°. ix + 251 pp.

Mr Stewart deals with forty odd passages in Shakespeare, many of them famous *cruces*. His general proceeding is not to suggest new emendations, but to put forward a defence of the Folio or Quarto text. It cannot be said that he is often successful, although he enforces his views at needless length and with a self-confidence which rises at times to bumptiousness. His English, too, is of a very breezy order.

With the majority of Mr Stewart's contentions it is quite unnecessary to deal as they are not likely to find any supporters besides himself. It is a pleasanter task to point out some cases in which his argument is at least plausible.

On *Henry V*, II, 2, 48, he defends 'Both to my God, one to my gracious King.'

On *Ant. and Cleop.*, I, 1, 18, he suggests: 'Grates me. The sum'—and supposes Antony to be recurring to the amount of his love, when he is interrupted by 'Nay, hear them, Antony.'

On *Cymbeline*, IV, 2, 106–112 (he accidentally omits a line in quoting the passage), he holds that it is Guiderius who is described in the lines:

> Being scarce made up
> I mean, to man, he had not apprehension
> Of roaring terrors; for defect of judgment
> Is oft the cause of fear.

Guiderius was too young to gauge a blustering bully: and therefore was inclined to fear where no fear was. If this be considered satisfactory, and I have little doubt that Mr Stewart is right in taking 'apprehension' as = 'understanding' rather than 'fear,' the difficulty presented by the word 'defect' has disappeared.

On *L. L. L.*, V, 2, 691, he is probably right in punctuating 'Greater than great. Great, great, great Pompey.'

On *Henry V*, II, 2, 118, 'He that tempered thee bade thee stand up,' the last words are explained on the supposition that the King is thinking of Scroop as having been knighted by the devil to do him service.

On *Lear*, IV, 6, 100, it is happily suggested that the words '*I know* that voice' suggested to the King's disordered brain 'Ay, No' and led to his outburst on flatterers. With this my agreement stops.

In the passage preceding this l. 72 Mr Stewart takes 'the clearest gods' to mean the gods most clearly proved as such, i.e. those attested by miracle. His remarks on Edgar's motives in leading Gloucester to the supposed brink of the cliff are perhaps the best thing in the book.

On *M. N. D.*, II, 1, 90, he rightly explains 'ringlets' as round dances. If he had consulted the *New English Dictionary*, he would have found that it did the same.

Miranda's words 'You play me false' (*Tempest*, V, 1, 170) are taken to mean 'You are not playing your best.' (In l. 172 should not 'yes' be 'yet'?)

On *II Henry IV*, I, 3, 36, a good defence is made for the words:

> Yes, if this present quality of war
> Indeed the instant action, a cause on foot,
> Lives so in hope, as etc.,

and on *As You Like It*, V, 4, 7, for 'as those that fear they hope, and know they fear.'

A plausible explanation is given of *All's Well*, II, 1, 14,

> let higher Italy,—
> Those bated, etc.,

though one may feel some doubt if 'higher Italy' can mean 'aristocratic Italy.'

On *Tempest*, IV, 1, 68, 'Thy banks with pioned and twilled brims,' it would again have been better to have consulted the *New English Dictionary*.

Mr Stewart is right, I think, in defending the soundness of *II Henry IV*, IV, 1, 95–97, and possibly so in accepting the Folio text of *Romeo and Juliet*, IV, 5, 39, 'And leave him all life living, all is death's.'

To turn to a few passages, in which I cannot follow Mr Stewart.

Meas. for Meas., II. 1, 40: 'Some run from brakes of ice and answer none' (where he takes 'brakes of ice' to mean 'frozen fens'): is it possible that the true reading is

Some run from brakes of Justice [written I^ce] and answer none,

i.e. from snares of the law? There is no metrical difficulty about the retention of 'and.'

Hamlet, IV, 4, 22, 'To pay five ducats, five, I would not farm it.' Here Mr Stewart seems to misunderstand 'To pay' (='if I had only to pay') and to take it as though it meant 'To bring me in a return.' He then argues the point on strict business principles.

Tit. And., II, 3, 128, Mr Stewart defends the line 'And with that painted hope braves your mightiness.' Here and elsewhere the fact that a line is metrically halting, does not seem to be considered worth consideration, if it is even noticed. Should we read 'painted copie' ('fictitious text')?

L. L. L., V, 2, 465, 'That smiles his cheek in years' ('yeares' Quarto). Mr Stewart would read 'yours.' Query, 'ye eares' (the ears)?

In a disquisition on Hamlet, Mr Stewart writes: 'His mother reports that he wept [after the murder of Polonius]: and we have no reason to doubt it.' We have every reason to doubt it, as Hamlet had enjoined on his mother not to give the King a true account of his behaviour, and what we see of Hamlet's conduct makes his weeping most unlikely.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Second Characters or The Language of Forms. By Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury. Edited by Benjamin Rand. Cambridge: University Press. 1914. 8vo. xxviii + 182 pp.

This volume represents an attempt to put together for the first time a work designed and to a great extent completed by the well-known author of the *Characteristics*, but left unfinished at his death in 1713. This was a treatise on æsthetics, which was intended to include (1) 'A Letter concerning Design,' which was actually printed in the year 1732; (2) an essay on 'The Historical Draught or Tablature of the Judgement of Hercules,' which was in 1714 included in the *Characteristics*, having first appeared in French during the author's life-time in

the *Journal des Sçavans* for November, 1712; (3) an 'Appendix concerning the Emblem of Cebes,' apparently unwritten; and (4) 'Plastics or the Original Progress and Power of the Designatory Arts,' which the author intended as the most important portion of his work, and which, so far as it was written, is now published for the first time.

In place of the 'Appendix concerning the Emblem of Cebes,' which is not forthcoming, the present editor has printed a translation of the *Picture* (or *Tablet*) of Cebes, which he found among the Shaftesbury papers, though not in Shaftesbury's handwriting. This was unnecessary and may perhaps be rather misleading. It would have been better in any case not to call it 'Treatise III,' because it was certainly not intended by the author to stand as part of his book.

For the interesting discovery of the plan of this work and for the text, so far as it was completed, of the fourth and principal part, 'Plastics,' we are indebted to the editor, a Harvard scholar, who is already known as an authority on the life and works of the third Earl of Shaftesbury. The debt is no small one, for Shaftesbury's ideas on æsthetic criticism are of great interest, and the addition which is here made to our knowledge of them is very considerable, in spite of the fragmentary condition in which the work was left. Dr Rand found the material which he here gives us for the first time in a manuscript volume among the Shaftesbury papers in the Record Office[1]. It is all the more desirable that full credit should be given him here for his discovery of the new materials and for his appreciation of the importance of them, because unfortunately a rather severe judgment must be pronounced on some of his editorial methods. Naturally reference will be made in this respect chiefly to that part of the present volume which is now published for the first time, namely the author's prefatory matter (pp. 1–16) and the treatise 'Plastics' (pp. 89–180).

In the first place it must be noted that the work as it appears in Shaftesbury's manuscript is not only in a very unfinished state, much of it in the form of rough jottings, and nothing finished, but also in a very casual order: the various sections of it were written independently and are far from having been fully combined by the author. In many cases, it is true, references are made by leaf numbers from one section to another, so as to indicate the sequence that was intended; thus f. 30 ends with a reference to 'inf. 51' to show that the subject is there continued, f. 74 has a similar reference to f. 100, and so in a good many cases. But these cross-references are by no means always found, and where they are absent the editor takes the liberty of arranging the text for himself, sometimes with doubtful result, and he supplies us with no information whatever as to the instances in which he has Shaftesbury's authority for the arrangement and those in which he has assumed the authority himself. Thus he makes f. 67 follow f. 52 (middle of p. 131 in this edition) without any indication from the

[1] Unfortunately he does not give us a reference to this volume by which it can be found. The true reference is 'Shaftesbury Papers, xxvii, 15.'

author, and similarly f. 59 follows f. 12 (p. 144), and f. 87 follows f. 59 (p. 146), with the implication, it may be observed, in these latter cases that the discussion of the first and second Parts of Painting is here complete, which there is reason to suppose is not the case. Even if the editor's order is right, probable gaps ought certainly to be indicated.

Then in an edition like this it would have been better perhaps to follow the author's own spelling and use of capitals, especially the latter, which is often significant. As it is, the desire to reform the spelling and get rid of the capitals has betrayed the editor into some rather absurd blunders, and we find 'satires, fawns' (p. 134), where the author correctly wrote 'Satyrs, Fauns,' 'thyrsites' (p. 136) for 'Thyrsites,' 'rehearsal' (p. 142) for 'Rehearsal,' as title of the play.

Again, and this is more serious, very many mistakes are made in reproducing the text, and this in spite of the fact that there is no particular difficulty in the handwriting. The following are some of those which have been noted in a casual examination of some portions of the manuscript:

p. 94, Note, l. 3, *for* egitu *read* Egittii; l. 4, *for* repartato, inventore *read* riputato inventore; l. 5, *for* riferisce." Pierio *read* riferisce Pierio.
p. 106, Note, *for* See McC. *read* See Mr L. Book...Chapt...[1].
p. 110, Note, l. 9, *for* pravia *read* prava; l. 23, *read* detrahere. Similitudinum.
p. 122, l. 13, *for* martyrs *read* Marsyas; l. 14, *read* be admitted and never Ryparography, for each of these are false[2].
p. 126, Note 2, *read* lætatur.
p. 130, l. 11, *for* the *read* tho.
p. 131, l. 9, *for* moderate *read* modest.
p. 133, l. 5, *for* il corbo *read* Theorbo; l. 19, *for* as *read* all; l. 24, *for* camps *read* Campo[3]; l. 28, *for* oration *read* Ovation.
p. 135, l. 22, *for* human *read* humour.
p. 136, l. 15, *for* looks *read* looses; l. 22, *read* and Honour.
p. 140, l. 21, *for* as *read* so; l. 22, *read* miscellanarian.
p. 141, l. 27, *for* Σύνεσις *read* Σύστασις.
p. 145, l. 3, *for* most proper *read* properest; l. 15, *read* as thrust; l. 32, *read* assistances.
p. 146, l. 28, *for* seam *read* Sum.
p. 147, Note 1, l. 3, *after* etc., *add* horridly disagrees with Green, so useful and frequent[4].
p. 148, l. 1, *read* Contraposizione delle Tinte.

The occurrence of these editorial faults is to be regretted, and the result is sometimes disastrous to the meaning, but we must not for this reason overlook the service which has been rendered to the public by the editor and by the Cambridge Press in making this new material accessible.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

[1] The reference is evidently to Locke.
[2] The editor's mistake is due to the fact that the last clause is written above the line.
[3] So also p. 147, l. 7. It is surprising that the editor should have failed to recognise this technical term.
[4] This unfortunate omission makes nonsense of the latter part of the note.

Coleridge and English Romanticism [*Kolridzh i angliiskii romantizm*]. By M. ZHERLITSYN. Odessa. 1914. Imperial 8vo. xv + 300 pp.

Serious studies on English literature written in Russian are so rare that one takes up M. Zherlitsyn's book on Coleridge with some curiosity. In a note preceding the Introduction the author seeks to conciliate the fiercer type of critic by telling him that the work is his first effort, and he expresses the hope that specialists, whose benevolent attention he solicits, will treat his omissions and errors 'sine ira et studio.' We also learn that the book earned for its author a gold medal awarded by the University of Novorossisk. M. Zherlitsyn's aim, he tells us, is to help Russians to understand an epoch of English literature with which they are not as a rule familiar. We may at once give it as our opinion that the book provides a well-arranged, clearly written and therefore useful account of Coleridge's services to Romanticism. Though there is no claim to original treatment, the author chooses good guides, and when he quotes or embodies the opinions of literary critics, which happens very often, he conscientiously refers the reader in footnotes to chapter and verse. He disapproves of Beers' *a priori* formula, preferring the inductive method of Brunetière, whose well-known dictum, 'les définitions ne se posent pas *a priori*, si ce n'est peut-être en mathématiques,' he adopts as his motto. M. Zherlitsyn sets out to examine the phenomena covered by the term 'romanticism' in a sense wide enough to include the various definitions laid down by critics, and to attempt to refer these phenomena to the conditions of political, religious and social life of Coleridge's period, and to show how these are derived from still earlier conditions. It may be of interest to quote here the famous Russian critic Belinski's view of romanticism. 'The field of romanticism,' he wrote, 'is the inward, spiritual life of man, that mysterious soil of the soul and the heart from which spring all vague strivings after the better and the higher, trying to find satisfaction in ideals created by the imagination.'

M. Zherlitsyn's book contains only four chapters: I. The history of Romanticism from Spenser to Coleridge. II. Life and literary activities of Coleridge. III. The theory of the poetry of Coleridge and Wordsworth. IV. The poetry of Coleridge and English Romanticism. The last two chapters contain critical analyses of Coleridge's chief poems with many illustrative quotations both from the English original and in Russian prose versions made by M. Zherlitsyn. This restriction in the number of chapters is a feature of the book that makes for concentration and adequate treatment of the main themes. Having briefly outlined the author's method, we need not do more than touch on one or two points, as the book breaks no new ground whether of fact or of opinion. We learn that of Coleridge's poems the 'Ancient Mariner' alone has been translated into Russian in its entirety; indeed, as a Russian critic has said, Coleridge's poetry is still caviare to the foreigner. M. Zherlitsyn's prose version of the passages from Coleridge which he quotes is usually accurate, though we have noted two or three

cases of misapprehension of the meaning of words. It is worth noting that, contrary to what might be expected from a language so rich and flexible, Russian is not a very good vehicle for a translation of the poetry of the great West European peoples. It is certainly inferior in this respect to German, French, and English, as will readily become apparent if we examine a Russian translation whether in verse or prose of one or other of the great English poets, especially those who have in a high degree the magic of words. The English poet who suffers least from translation into Russian, as into other European languages, is Byron, of whose poems there are several successful Russian versions. M. Zherlitsyn's book should prove a boon to those of his countrymen, not a few, who love and study English literature, as it gives a better account of English romanticism than any work yet published in Russia.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

MANCHESTER.

L'art dramatique à Valencia, depuis les origines jusqu'au commencement du XVII^e siècle. Par HENRI MÉRIMÉE. Toulouse: Privat, 1913. 4to. 734 pp.

Spectacles et Comédiens à Valencia (1580–1630). Par HENRI MÉRIMÉE. Toulouse: Privat, 1913.

In 1840 Luis Lamarca published a treatise of seventy-eight pages on the subject to which Professor Mérimée now devotes two volumes aggregating one thousand pages. No other phase of the Spanish drama has been treated so exhaustively and critically. A distinctly provincial type of play did not however exist in Spain, and it is only because our author has consulted documents in the archives of Valencia, and has studied all the extant plays of Valencian dramatists, enabling him to throw new light upon what was typical of the drama in other parts of Spain, especially at Madrid, that such a bulky treatment of his subject can be justified. Tables of contents and indexes are provided.

Professor Mérimée is of course without local pride or bias, and writes dispassionately, and at times apologetically, of the mediocre dramatic productions of the practical Valencians. The list of playwrights is a short one, and of none can it be stated that he improved upon the type of plays produced elsewhere in the Peninsula. Valencia's actors, if not the ablest in Spain, were at least the most numerous, and the author very appropriately recalls the remark of Vélez de Guevara that the surnames of most actors were Valencian.

The period of greatest dramatic activity at Valencia, 1560 to 1630, coincides with that in Castile and the rest of Spain. During this period, Madrid became the political and literary centre of the Peninsula. Guillén de Castro, the last of the Valencian dramatists, left his native

city in 1603. His plays are cast in the same mould as the national 'comedia,' and with him Professor Mérimée closes his history.

Throughout the work, much space is devoted to the study of the social and political environment. Chapters are provided on the origins of the religious drama—chiefly Corpus Christi performances—the semi-secularized court plays of the Juan del Encina Castilian type, popular plays written at Valencia about 1560 by Juan de Timoneda, and acted in court-yards by professional, strolling actors; the pseudo-classical, academic efforts of Rey de Artieda and Virués, about 1580; and lastly the 'comedia,' from about 1590 to 1630, produced by Tárrega, Aguilar, and Guillén de Castro. During this last period, only a few of the plays acted at Valencia represented home production, and theatre-goers accepted whatever was offered by strolling players who brought their plays to Valencia.

It is easy to prophesy that the section devoted to the 'comedia' will first need revision, for until we have a critical study of Lope de Vega's dramatic art, based as a *sine qua non* upon a chronological arrangement of his plays, the conclusions of even an excellent investigator like Professor Mérimée must be taken with caution. Tárrega, Aguilar, and Guillén de Castro accepted the type of play evolved by the great master, but the type was not a fixed one and the plays of 1590 differ in technique, notably in the use of strophic forms, as well as in their fundamental structure, owing especially to the development of the 'gracioso,' from those of 1600 and subsequent years. But all this has not prevented our author from writing some very brilliant paragraphs on the 'comedia.' Where else is the indebtedness of the 'comedia' to the pseudo-classical tragedy of 1580 to 1586 so well analyzed, or Lope's sojourn in Valencia in 1589 and its significance so well described, or, to mention only two more good chapters in this section, where else are the characteristics of the 'comedia' itself, and that indispensable concomitant, the 'gracioso,' so clearly stated?

An extensive study like Professor Mérimée's is sure to contain a few inaccuracies. For example, an *Egloga pastoril* (pp. 105 ff.), written about 1520 is referred to as 'l'œuvre la plus ancienne du théâtre laïque à Valencia.' The last lines of the eclogue indicate very clearly, however, that the play was not intended for acting:

> Si mi obra no estuviere
> Tal qual requiere razón,
> Si alguna confusión viere
> Qualquiera que la leyere...

Timoneda may be called the father of the drama in Valencia. Our author allows him credit only for good business instincts. One may question whether there is sufficient evidence for such an interpretation of his pioneer efforts at dramatic production. Certainly Professor Mérimée misinterprets (p. 148) the significance of the device on the shield which adorns the title-pages of Timoneda's works. In 'La moneda es un metal que haze bien y mucho mal' we have simply a pun

on Ti-moneda. One of the best chapters in the book is a study of the pseudo-classical school of dramatists. The following statement found there is however incomprehensible to the reviewer: 'Or, ni Cueva ni Artieda ne se sont contentés d'un rythme unique et monotone; s'ils se sont largement servis de l'hendécasyllabe blanc, ils ont fait aussi appel à d'autres combinaisons rythmiques et parmi celles-ci aux vers proprement nationaux, tel le vers de romance...' (p. 285). Most of what our author has to say on the important question of the drama from 1580 on needs revision[1]. Let us limit our attention to the statement just quoted. In their use of strophic forms Artieda and Cueva belong to different schools. The backbone of Artieda's only extant play is the 'quintilla,' a strophe that Cueva never used—Tárrega and Aguilar, Valencians like Artieda, did. On the other hand, tercets, of which the Sevillian was very fond, are wholly lacking in *Los Amantes*, Artieda's play. Finally, where do Cueva and Artieda ever use the blank hendecasyllabic line[2] or the 'romance'? It is a traditional error in histories of the Spanish drama to state that the popular, national metre, the 'romance,' was introduced contemporaneously with the first use of national subjects. Professor Mérimée is good in all that he says about the 'gracioso'—his origin, characteristics, and place in the 'comedia'—but one would like to have reasons for assigning to 1602 *La Francesilla* (p. 526), in which Lope declared that the 'figura del donaire' was first introduced. The bibliography is a model of thoroughness. The author states that he worked in the libraries of Valencia, Madrid, Paris, and London. He seems to have been indifferent to the Spanish treasures of other well-known libraries. One of his pupils succeeded in finding a copy of the rare first part of Pérez de Montalván's plays at Rennes. Some years ago, Stiefel called attention to copies at Munich and Heidelberg. There are no doubt copies of rare books that concern the drama at Valencia more directly in the extensive collections of Munich, Göttingen, and Vienna, to mention only a few libraries that Professor Mérimée has failed to consult. Among modern books one misses Creizenach's *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*. True, this work is weakest in the section devoted to the Spanish drama of the sixteenth century, but it cannot be overlooked altogether. When the author says (p. 668) that the *Cancionero de Obras de Burlas provocantes á Risa*, reprinted at London, in 1841, is 'fort rare,' he but repeats Salvá. This reprint appears so frequently in sale catalogues that it can no longer be called rare.

Spectacles et Comédiens à Valencia is complementary to the work just reviewed. It is especially valuable because it is based upon documents for the most part found in the archives of the General Hospital of Valencia, which owned the theatre of la Olivera and controlled the less important Santets. The chapter headings will give

[1] For example: 'la comedia a adopté pour son usage les mêmes rythmes dont la tragédie avait usé' (p. 419).

[2] A few lines in blank verse, eighty-one to be exact, will be found in Cueva's *Comedia del Viejo enamorado* (Act II).

an idea of the matter discussed: buildings; performances; rivals—private, official, or acrobatic performances in the city; actors, including staging. The author has limited his evidence to documents, and indications found in plays written by Valencians. The result is a safe foundation for a study of the stage in Spain, a subject that has up to the present been treated very amateurishly.

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

TORONTO.

A Saudade Portuguesa. Divagações Filológicas e Literar-históricas em volta de Inês de Castro e do Cantar Velho 'Saudade minha ¿Quando te veria?' Por CAROLINA MICHAËLIS DE VASCONCELLOS. Porto: Renascença Portuguesa. 1914. 144 pp.

To those acquainted with the work of Dona Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos it will come as no surprise that this little book, of few and very brief pages, presents more matter of value than many a long treatise. Each of the nine chapters and most of the 168 notes contain so much of interest that it is difficult to choose among them. In Ch. I one may note that the crowning of Ines after her death and the burial of Ines and King Pedro in such a way that their eyes—hers green and King Pedro's jet-black—should meet when the last trumpet sounds—are both declared to be purely legendary. Ch. IV deals faithfully with the *Cartas de Ega Moniz* and other apocryphal poems still sometimes accepted as genuine by Portuguese critics, but which are, as D. Carolina shows, clearly inventions of the seventeenth century. In Ch. V the words *soidade* and *saudade* are laid on the operating table. The result of the dissection is that the word *saudade* (*salus*) was grafted, at a comparatively late date, on the word *soidade, suidade* (*solus*): i.e. the cultured word on the word of more popular growth. The form *suidade* 'was preferred by classical writers till 1580' (p. 52). The use of *suidade* in the eclogue of Manuel de Faria e Sousa (1590–1649) is of course a deliberate archaism. The existence of the form *saudade* in a MS. of the fourteenth century is doubtful. The date of the MS. is uncertain, and if the word is written *saudade* it may have been due to a later hand. No one who knows how MSS. were handled in Portugal will doubt the probability of its having been 'touched up,' brought up to date. For instance, in the 'Red Book' of King Affonso V (1438–81) Brazil is mentioned, although it was not discovered until after King Affonso's death. The explanation is that the original MS. was damaged 'by rain-water and the sea' when King João III (1521–57) was crossing from Alcacer do Sal to Setubal in 1531, and was therefore 'copied.' But how was the fusion between *soidade* and *saudade* effected? The normal development is the reverse, as the author points out (p. 54), from *au* to *oi*: e.g. *aurum, oiro.* The

cultured form *Rua Aurea* becomes in popular speech *Rua do Oiro*. Sra Michaëlis de Vasconcellos thinks that it was due to the *samdações* from absent friends and quotes from a letter belonging to the time of Camões:

Saudade em que ando,
Saudades cem mil mando.

Perhaps beginning with a play on words it went from the cultured to the unlettered, who accepted it seriously. The derivation of *soidade* from *solitudo* was of course well known, and the Spanish *soledad* was considered its equivalent. Gil Vicente in *Dom Duardos* quotes the *villancico*:

Soledad tengo de ti
Oh tièrra donde naci.

(He has *O tierras.*) In the same play we have:

¡ Que haré, soledad mia ?

and in the *Comedia sobre a Divisa da Cidade de Coimbra* again:

Soledad tengo de ti,
Heridea.

And Camões uses *soidade* as = ' desert.' Ch. 8 is also of extraordinary interest, for, dealing with *Saudade minha, ¿quando vos veria ?* it shows that the *mote* (cf. Italian *motto*, Low Latin *muttum*, and our *mutter*) or *cantar velho* was often nothing but a popular proverb. The rhythm of many proverbs is striking. It is as if the aged, sitting at their doors, were beating time—at first slowly and then more quickly—to the younger folk dancing *de terreiro*:

Em Janeiro
Sete capellos e um sombreiro,

or

Sol de Janeiro
Sempre anda detraz do outeiro.

And Sra Michaëlis de Vasconcellos says (p. 76) 'Between the *refrão* and the *cantar* the only difference would be that between the spoken experience of the old and the inexperienced singing of the young.' Opportunity is taken to consider the corrupt text of the popular *mote* in C. V. 1043:

Ó pee d'ũa torre
Baila corpo piolo.

The edition of 1878 gives:

baila corp' e giolo,

which is an even darker saying. Here (p. 84) we have the suggestion *baila corpo gracioso* or (p. 140) *friolo* (*frivolus, frioleira, frileux*). That some such adjective is required is proved by C. V. 889 : *baylava corpo velido, corpo delgado.*

A later *glosa* of the *Saudade minha* than those here given are the *voltas* of Soror Violante do Ceo (1601–93), and it is interesting to notice that Soror Violante must have known the verse quoted by D. Carolina in the *Zeitschrift für rom. Philologie* some years ago, and here, p. 91, from a MS. of the Visconde de Juromenha, since she writes:

este quando
que a ser logo tarda.

In fine this tiny volume on every page raises or solves some attractive problem of literature or philology.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL.

Ludvig Holbergs Samlede Skrifter. Med Understøttelse af Carlsbergfondet udgivne af CARL S. PETERSEN. Vols. I and XIX, 1. Copenhagen: Gyldendal. 1913. 4to. xv + 690 pp. and 40 pp.

Ludvig Holberg som Historiker. Av FRANCIS BULL. Christiania: H. Aschehoug og Co. 1913. 8vo. 181 pp.

Om Holbergs historiske Skrifter. Af SIGURD HØST. Bergen: J. Grieg. 1913. 8vo. 184 pp.

Holbergs Unge Dage. Med forskjellige Bidrag til det historiske Tidsbillede. Av VILJAM OLSVIG. Christiania: Gyldendal. 1912. 8vo. xvi + 655 pp.

Holberg og England. Av VILJAM OLSVIG. Christiania: H. Aschehoug og Co. 1913. 8vo. 346 pp.

The Comedies of Holberg. By OSCAR J. CAMPBELL (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, vol. III). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: H. Milford). 1914. 8vo. ix + 363 pp.

Comedies by Holberg: Jeppe of the Hill, The Political Tinker, Erasmus Montanus. Translated from the Danish by O. J. CAMPBELL and F. SCHENCK, with an Introduction by O. J. CAMPBELL (*Scandinavian Classics*, vol. I). New York: The American-Scandinavian Foundation (London: H. Milford). 1914. 12mo. xv + 178 pp.

Ludvig Holberg is one of those sincere, clear-sighted, matter-of-fact personalities who stud the literature of Europe in the eighteenth century more liberally than that of any other age. It has been said that he is not sufficiently original to justify his study by others than special students of Scandinavian literature; but this is not quite fair to him; it does not take count of the fascinating personal note that runs through all his writings; he grows rapidly on the reader with closer acquaintance. Moreover, he shows us better than any other man of letters of his time north of the Alps, how the spiritual culture of Latin Europe mirrored itself in the northern mind. This is his special

significance from the point of view of comparative literature. Putting his dramatic achievement—and it is as a dramatic writer he is best known and appreciated—even at its lowest, he adapted the comedy-type of Molière to the Germanic mind, and made that writer a force in German and Scandinavian literature which he would not otherwise have become. And even if we cannot put a finger on many points of direct indebtedness, it seems probable that Holberg learned how to assimilate Molière from his English predecessors, the comedy-writers of the Restoration; just as our Drydens and Vanbrughs peopled Molière's plays with English men and women, so Holberg filled them with his Danish fellow-countrymen.

It is not so long ago since one might have been justified in complaining that the materials available for the understanding of the fantastic world of Peder Paars and Jean de France, of Niels Klim and Jakob von Tyboe, were scant; there was Prutz's old-fashioned German book on Holberg, now some sixty years old, and Brandes' attractive and appetising monograph, written in 1884; there were also the more special studies on the comedies by Rahbek, Legrelle and Skavlan. But in recent years the literature on Holberg has swelled enormously, and goes on growing at an increasing rate; one can imagine the accommodation of the little Holberg library in Bergen—with which the present writer has pleasant associations—being by this time taxed to its uttermost. I propose to deal here with some of the more recent publications which are concerned with the greatest of the Dano-Norwegian men of letters.

With the financial aid of the Carlsberg Fund, which is doing so much to further Scandinavian literary research, a beginning has been made to a magnificent *édition définitive* of Holberg's works; when this is completed, few, if any, writers of the eighteenth century will possess a nobler monument. The new edition opens with Holberg's historical writings: the *Introduction til de Europæiske Riges Historie* (1711), with its *Anhang* (1713); and the *Introduction til Natur- og Folkeretten* (1716), another volume containing the variants and critical apparatus. The whole is under the editorship of Carl S. Petersen of the Royal Library in Copenhagen.

Holberg as a historian is the theme of two recent Scandinavian studies, which naturally cover, to a large extent, the same ground; but they are sufficiently supplementary to each other to be both worth careful attention. Herr Bull's is the more scholarly and thorough-going; and he restricts his attention mainly to the historical works in the narrower sense of the word; while Herr Høst writes with a view to a wider audience and discusses at greater length works such as Holberg's imitation of Plutarch, the *Helte- og Heltinde-Historier*, which, only by a stretch of the definition, may be included in the category of historical writings. It is interesting to observe, with the help of these two studies, how Holberg the historian gradually emancipated himself from the uninspiring methods of the Renaissance, how, at the hand of Pufendorf, he breathed life into the writing of history, how he not

merely chronicled, but also tried to elucidate the organic movement of national development. Holberg is a disciple of Pufendorf, as everybody was who left his mark on history-writing in the early years of the eighteenth century; his *Introduction til de Europæiske Riges Historie*[1] is closely modelled on Pufendorf's *Einleitung zu der Historie der vornehmsten Reiche und Staaten so jetziger Zeit in Europa sich befinden* (Frankfort, 1682–86). Herr Bull makes a careful comparison of the two works with a view to estimating just how much is the work of the great German, how much is Holberg's. The result of this comparison is a vindication of Holberg's originality, not so much in respect of matter, as in his attitude to and criticism of the historical facts.

There is one point, particularly interesting to us, which neither of these Scandinavian critics of Holberg's historical studies faces fairly, and that is Holberg's possible indebtedness as a historian to England. Holberg himself said of his *Introduction*: 'I commenced this work in England when I had an opportunity of consulting the books from which the materials are taken in the Bodleian Library, and when I was animated with the desire of becoming an author before I had acquired a beard[2].' This was in 1706–7, and possibly both critics might have had a little more to say on this point had they had before them the abundant materials which Herr Olsvig has brought to light in his new work on *Holberg og England.*

Viljam Olsvig is the most industrious of Holberg scholars, and had already some five or six studies to his credit before he began, three years ago, with *Holbergs Unge Dage*, what appears to be intended to form a many-volumed and exhaustive biography of Holberg. Olsvig's books are, frankly, not very readable works, being rather the foundation for books than books themselves. They are thrown together without order, or any consideration for proportion, even, for that matter, for relevancy. But by his indefatigable research, Olsvig has thrown light on many dark places in Holberg's life; he has justified his labours, and made the re-writing of much of the early chapters of Holberg's life necessary. His object is not merely to arrive at accurate data as regards Holberg's life, but also to re-create the *milieu*, to reproduce the atmosphere of Holberg's youth; one cannot, however, help thinking that a more intuitive writer might have achieved more in this direction with a less expenditure of printer's ink. The second volume on Holberg's visit to England is even a greater effort at reconstruction than the first. Holberg, in his autobiography, describes this visit in some seven or eight pages; Herr Olsvig expands this to 340! Holberg tells us briefly that 'after a voyage of four days we arrived at Gravesend, a town situated at the mouth of the river Thames.... On

[1] This work was translated into English in 1755: *An Introduction to Universal History.* Translated from the Latin of Baron Holberg. With Notes, Historical, Chronological, and Critical. By Gregory Sharpe. London, 1755; new ed., 1787; and even before this, there had appeared an abridgement in Latin and English.

[2] I quote from the English translation of Holberg's autobiography (*Memoirs of Lewis Holberg, written by himself in Latin, and now first translated into English*), published as vol. xii of a series of *Autobiographies*, London, 1830, p. 34.

leaving Gravesend we proceeded on foot to London. I acted as interpreter for my companion, who was ignorant of the English language, and could only attempt to make himself intelligible by signs. We stayed a short time in London, where I took care to see everything that was shown for nothing[1].' This is all Holberg has himself to say about London; but, on the strength of it, Olsvig proceeds to reconstruct the London of 1706, and describe with excessive minuteness all that Holberg might possibly have seen and experienced. All this is, of course, not without its value; but there is ground for complaint that Olsvig has failed to draw conclusions commensurate with the fulness of his research. What did Holberg really owe to England and Oxford? We know that he has written on English history and English political life with fulness of knowledge and peculiar insight—the evidence will be found fully set forth in Olsvig's book; but how far was his general outlook on the art of history-writing influenced by us? What share had Oxford in his advance—if advance it was—on Pufendorf's beginnings? This, it seems to me, is a question that still awaits fuller discussion than it has received in any of these works before us.

Holberg's Danish history, *Danmarks Riges Historie*, remains his historical masterpiece; and one must guard against taking his other, later historical writings too seriously. His *Almindelig Kirkehistorie* and especially the mechanically compiled *Jødisk Historie*, with its solemn discussion of the social conditions before the Flood, make the impression of being only hackwork undertaken under pressure from some publisher. The *Heltehistorier* and *Heltindehistorier*, on the other hand, although hardly history, are attractive specimens of Danish prose in an age when good prose was far to seek north of the Alps; moreover, they throw a suggestive light on the men and things that interested the early eighteenth century; show how closely greatness and moral greatness were identified; and how the romanticism of the human spirit—not to be quenched by the most logical rationalism—found an outlet in the literary exploitation of the wonders of the Orient. In Denmark as in France and England, Saladin and Aurung-Zebe were names to conjure with, names that set even the most soberly disciplined fancies roving. The criterion of moral greatness is not so self-apparent among the 'heroines,' amongst whom Holberg included Renaissance *grandes dames* like Catarina di Medici—compared with Agrippina—whose activities could not be described as 'moral.' But the collection also includes our own Elizabeth—as well as our two Marys—and the unhappy Eleonora Christine von Uhlfeld, for whom Holberg finds a parallel in Lady Jane Grey. Holberg had evidently more in view here than merely to provide the readers of the *Heltehistorier* with supplementary female interest; he seems to have been of the opinion that women were intellectually just as able to play important rôles in the history of the world as men, were the opportunities offered them. Professor Campbell in his study of Holberg quotes (pp. 358 f.) an

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 18, 25.

interesting suggestion by Professor Schofield that Holberg might possibly have been influenced by the example of the Anglo-Saxon scholar, Elizabeth Elstob, who defended vigorously a woman's right to become a scholar and insisted that a woman's intellect was inferior to a man's not by nature, but because of her inferior education.

Professor Campbell's book, the first monograph on Holberg in English, deals mainly with him as a dramatist. It is an attractively written book which will induce many readers to turn to the excellent translations of three of Holberg's plays, *Jeppe of the Hill*, *The Political Tinker* and *Erasmus Montanus*, which Mr Campbell, together with Mr F. Schenck, has contributed to the series published by the American-Scandinavian Society[1]. These translations are lively and natural, and reproduce with great skill the broken Danish and the verbal quips of the original; but is it quite fair to describe Herman von Bremen by the traditional 'tinker'? It can hardly be claimed that Holberg's comedies had any measure of influence on our English dramatic literature. For the Germans, on the other hand, his dramas were a factor of magnitude, which has not yet been estimated at its full importance, and that in spite of the useful reprint of the old translations by Detharding and others, published by Hoffory and Schlenther[2]. In any case, Holberg's plays have incontestable merit, and occupy a niche of their own in the European literature of the early eighteenth century.

From the point of view of literary research Mr Campbell's work is somewhat disappointing, being, in the main, an amplification of Rahbek's and Skavlan's results. He has set out to correct the view, maintained by Legrelle, that Molière's example was the main factor in Holberg's art; but he has not added materially to the evidence already adduced by Scandinavian investigators with regard to Holberg's indebtedness to the Commedia dell' Arte, as represented by Gherardi's collection. A comparison of Holberg's plays with the printed text is not enough here; we must also know something of the form in which the Gherardi scenarios were performed on the Danish stage before Holberg came forward as a rival to Gherardi. From Overskou we know that Montaigu had played the Gherardi repertory from 1715 onwards[3]; but details of that repertory are wanting. And obviously the first step towards a complete understanding of Holberg as a playwright is an

[1] It may be recalled that three other comedies, *Henry and Pernilla*, *Captain Bombastes Thunderton*, and *Scatterbrains* (i.e., *Den Stundesløse*) were published in English translation in 1912 by Lieut.-Col. H. W. L. Hime. *The Babbling Barber* (*Gert Westfaler*) was translated in 1826; *The Blue-aproned Statesman* and *Erasmus Montanus* by T. Weber, Copenhagen, 1885. This, as far as I am aware, exhausts the list of our translations of Holberg's comedies.

[2] *Dänische Schaubühne: Die vorzüglichsten Komödien des Freiherrn Ludwig von Holberg in den ältesten deutschen Übersetzungen*, herausg. von F. Hoffory und P. Schlenther. 2 vols., Berlin, 1888. It is noticeable that M. G. Belouin, the author of an able study of the origins of the modern German theatre (*De Gottsched à Lessing*, Paris, 1909), virtually ignores Holberg; on the other hand, the statement of a recent English critic that Holberg's plays formed the principal part of the repertory of the Schönemann company is an exaggeration.

[3] *Den danske Skueplads*, Copenhagen, 1854, i, pp. 123 ff.

investigation of the conditions prevailing on the Danish stage of his time.

Professor Campbell naturally makes out a strong case for English influence on Holberg's dramas; but this, as he has himself clearly felt, is a difficult and elusive matter. There is an obvious danger in attributing too much to the effect of Holberg's visit to England, in respect of his dramatic work. He was in England in 1706–7, and he did not begin to write comedies until 1721. Considering that Holberg, as far as we can see, had little interest in the theatre when he was in England, and remembering all the varied experiences Holberg had come through in the interval, it seems safer to reduce the claim of direct influence of the English theatre to a minimum. The strongest proof—perhaps we might say, apart from the names of the characters in *Don Ranudo*, which come from the Dryden-Davenant version of *The Tempest*, the only strong proof—of an influence of the English drama is the fact that Farquhar's *Recruiting Officer* supplied an episode in *Erasmus Montanus*. Possibly Holberg saw that play in London in 1706; it was, at least, performed then, as Professor Campbell shows, although hardly one of the things that were 'shown for nothing' to which Holberg's limited resources obliged him to restrict himself. That, on the other hand, Holberg was directly influenced by Ben Jonson seems to me entirely unproven; and had Mr Campbell been more familiar with recent literature on the motive which forms the framework of *The Taming of the Shrew*[1], he would have been more cautious before endorsing the claim of the older Scandinavian critics that that play had—directly, at least—served Holberg as a model for his *Jeppe paa Bjerget*. Mr Campbell's most valuable contribution to our knowledge of Holberg's sources is the evidence he brings forward of his extensive borrowings from the *Tatler*, of which Olsvig had given a hint in his *Det store Vendepunkt i Holbergs Liv* (1895).

In spite of the limitations I have indicated, his book on Holberg deserves a hearty welcome, as pioneer work in the best sense; Professor Campbell has given us an attractive account of this great Northerner, who told with pride—if not in immaculate English—that he had been taken for an Englishman, and whose mental attitude and mental constitution had so much in common with those of our people in the eighteenth century.

J. G. Robertson.

London.

Keys to the Baskish Verb in Leizarraga's New Testament, A.D. 1571. By E. S. Dodgson. London: Humphrey Milford. 1915. 8vo. 624 pp.

Most persons when confronted with the gigantic construction of the Basque verb are content to salute it in awe and pass by on the other

[1] See A. von Weilen, *Shakespeares Vorspiel zu der Widerspänstigen Zähmung*, Frankfort o. M., 1884.

side. Mr Edward Spencer Dodgson, with the courage of Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, has attacked it and conquered. He has devoted thirty years to its study, and this valuable 'analytical quotational synopsis' of 1673 of the forms of its verb proves that his toil has not been spent in vain. He is unlikely to have many followers in this fray, for in a sense the victory must be barren. Basque literature is scanty. There is, however, no reason why it should not increase. A Basque newspaper is published, there are Basque grammars and dictionaries, and Mr Dodgson's publications will help to fix a language which is always in danger of splitting up into as many dialects as there are Basque villages. Its difficulty has been overestimated and, apart from the verb, consists rather in the fact that it is spoken mainly by peasants and is in a fluid state than in any intrinsic obstacles. It is written as it is pronounced, and were the beginner assisted by a number of novels in Basque dealing with the history and traditions of the delightful Basque country and its no less delightful inhabitants he would make speedy progress. Unfortunately, and quite unfairly, Basque has been given a bad name. Basque words *nostro ore concipi nequeunt* said Pomponius Mela. It was in vain for Scaliger to declare that it contained *nihil barbari, nihil stridoris.* Its evil reputation only grew with the years. The disfavour of Portuguese writers towards it is especially marked. Even in the eighteenth century Antonio de Mello Fonseca speaks of *a lingua horrida dos Biscainhos* (*Antidoto da Lingua Portugueza*, Amsterdam, [1710]), and a modern novelist, Camillo Castello Branco, uses the expression *no seu vasconço plebeu*, i.e. 'in his vulgar jargon.' The roughness and difficulty of Basque thus became proverbial and *vasconço, vasconcear* have the meaning of 'unintelligible language,' 'to talk nonsense' in the same way as *arabia, aravia, algaravia, em arabio, algaraviar*, and, far more rarely, *germania* and *inglezia.* In the anonymous *Auto do Dia do Juizo* (Lisboa, 1665) Lucifer says

> Eu sey vasconço e latim,

and the marketwoman shows no surprise at his knowledge of Basque, but asks

> Latim quem volo ensinou?

A little earlier Antonio de Sousa de Macedo notices that the *Vizcainos* pretend that their language is more ancient than Portuguese, but all languages, he says, change with time, *y lo mismo sería en la Vascuença* (*Flores de España, Excelencias de Portugal* (Lisboa, 1631), f. 236 v.). Frey Antonio da Purificaçam in his *Chronica da Antiquissima Provincia de Portugal da Ordem dos Eremitas*, Lisboa, 1642, in praising the Portuguese language, says that 'it expresses no syllable gutturally, which is what makes pronunciation difficult, and is much in use among the Basques and the Moors'; and Alvaro Ferreira de Vera contrasts the ease and suavity of Portuguese which 'is written as it is pronounced, unlike the German and Basque (Vasconço).' The language of the *Vizcaînhos* 'is such that it cannot be written.' (*Breves Lovvores da*

lingva portvgvesa, Lisboa 1631.) Yet nearly a century earlier a Basque priest, Bernard Dechepare, had published poems in his native tongue (*Linguae Vasconum Primitiae*, Bordeaux 1545), in one of which he had addressed the Basque language, with a patriotic exaggeration worthy of the Portuguese grammarians, as superior to French or any other tongue, and said 'Basque, hitherto thou hast never been printed, henceforth thou shalt traverse the whole world.' And eleven years after Ferreira de Vera's book was published another Basque priest, Pierre d'Axular, *curé* of Sare, whose work has been edited recently by Don Julio de Urquijo, wrote his important *Gueroco Gueroa* in prose. Between these two priests a third, Jean Leiçarraga (who, however, embraced the reformed religion), had rendered Basque its greatest service by translating from the Greek the New Testament which he dedicated to the Queen of Navarre in 1571. The fact that it was the work of a Protestant did not help to make it popular among the Basques and no doubt accounts for its present rarity. (Mr Dodgson says that nearly thirty copies exist.) In the eighteenth century a Basque named Haraneder (Fairvale) prepared another version for Roman Catholic readers, which did not see the light till 1855. But Leiçarraga's faithful translation still holds the field, and it is to be hoped that a cheap edition will be widely distributed among the Basques, not with any idea of weakening the Roman Catholic religion, which has nowhere shown to better advantage than in the Basque provinces and which no sane person would wish to undermine there, but in order to strengthen the fine old Basque language, for which Mr Dodgson shows so singlehearted a devotion.

Aubrey F. G. Bell.

S. João do Estoril.

MINOR NOTICES.

In the 'World's Classics' series we have had lately from the Oxford University Press (London: H. Milford, 1913) a compact edition of Milton's *English Poems*, which professes to be from Dr Beeching's text. It should have been mentioned, however, that the spelling, use of capitals and punctuation are for the most part modernised, so that one of the most interesting features of Dr Beeching's text, namely its exact reproduction of what was apparently Milton's own usage in these respects, is almost entirely lost. It is true that the Miltonic apostrophe has usually been preserved in the case of the definite article before a vowel, 'Let us not slip th' occasion,' 'Created hugest that swim th' Ocean stream' (though the capital letter of 'Ocean' is sacrificed); but it has not been kept in the termination of the past tense and past participle of weak verbs, where it has a definite metrical significance, e.g. 'And leave a singed bottom all involv'd With stench and smoke.' And what objection can there be to preserving Milton's distinction between 'fixed' and 'fixt,' 'wished' and 'wisht,' 'arched' and 'archt'? When we write 'Archangel' for 'Arch Angel,' we are actually changing the words that the poet wrote. His use of capitals, too, has a significance which is worth preserving, though occasionally the printer has misapplied them.

In other respects this edition is a marvel of cheapness and excellence.

G. C. M.

Poems in Two Volumes, by W. Wordsworth (Oxford Library of Prose and Poetry; London, Henry Frowde, 1913), is an exact reprint of the Bodleian copy of the 1807 edition, except for the numbering of the lines and the correction of a few misprints for the most part in accordance with the edition of 1815 in which most of the poems were reprinted. It is interesting and profitable to have these cheap and excellent reprints of early editions and a great help to appreciation of the exact circumstances of publication. Why, however, should not the pagination have been throughout the same as that of the original? It is reproduced page for page and the difference arises simply from counting in the eight preliminary pages (which might as well have been numbered separately) and numbering the pages of the two volumes continuously. However this is a very small point, and no mistake can possibly be made because of the careful indications in the Table of Contents.

G. C. M.

Mr Arnold Wynne's *Growth of English Drama* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914) is a pleasantly written account of the drama from the Miracle Plays to Marlowe and should be of interest to the general reader as well as to the young student. The writer's criticisms have the merit of appearing to be his own genuine judgments, and it is of criticism that the book consists, for biographical information about the authors mentioned is conspicuous by its absence. Where Mr Wynne does deal with points of exact knowledge, he is sometimes at fault. It is misleading, we think, to speak of one of the great cycles like the Coventry cycle as 'a play,' and of its particular plays as 'scenes' (pp. 23, 28). An 'Interlude,' as Mr Chambers has shown, is probably not a 'stop-gap... between other events' (p. 69) but a dialogue between two or more speakers. It is annoying to have Bishop Still once more credited with the authorship of *Gammer Gurton's Needle* (pp. 91, 224), still more to read that the play 'was *acted* at Christ's College, Cambridge' in 1566. Mr Wynne seems to credit the authors of *Gorboduc* (p. 103) with the invention of the dumb-show. This, as Dr Cunliffe has suggested, was probably an adaptation of the Italian *intermedii*. He takes Lyly's *Woman in the Moon*, his only blank-verse play, to have preceded his plays in prose. Professor Bond's opinion is far more probable that it was Lyly's last play, its form being affected by the new fashion for blank verse started by Kyd and Marlowe. He reproduces Mr Halpin's old interpretation of the supposed topical references in Lyly's *Endimion* without referring to Professor Feuillerat's more recent interpretation, or to Professor Percy W. Long's destructive criticism of both (p. 136). He gives the date of the building of The Theatre as 1572 instead of 1576 (p. 274). One may disagree with Mr Wynne's view that *Edward II* is Marlowe's masterpiece, and yet allow his right to hold it. It is hard however to understand a critic who thinks that in it 'King Edward is not portrayed as weak mentally or morally,' even in his demonstrations of affection towards Gaveston. On p. 70, l. 4 'demised' (though so printed by Hazlitt) should be 'devised,' and on p. 115, l. 10 from bottom, 'seventy' should be 'twenty.'

G. C. M. S.

It is late in the day to praise the admirable and compact handbook which Messrs W. A. Neilson and A. H. Thorndike have provided us with in their *Facts about Shakespeare* (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1913). It does not supersede Mr Morton Luce's *Handbook to Shakespeare's Works*, so valuable for its analysis of the plots and characters of particular plays. But the new book supplements Mr Luce's excellently, as will be seen when we say that it contains chapters on Shakespeare's England and London, Biographical Facts and Traditions, Shakespeare's Reading, Chronology and Development, The Elizabethan Drama, The Elizabethan Theatre, The Text of Shakespeare, Questions of Authenticity, Shakespeare since 1616, a concluding chapter, and a most useful Appendix

of Biographical Documents and Authorities, as well as an Index of the Characters in Shakespeare's Plays, an Index of the Songs, and a Bibliography of the subject treated in each of the first nine chapters. It would have been hard to imagine that so much that is useful and sound could have been provided in so small a compass.

G. C. M. S.

Echoes from the Classics ('Oxford Garlands'), selected by R. M. Leonard (London, H. Milford, 1914), consists of a collection of English poems, each of which contains an 'echo' or reminiscence (often of a very vague or trivial kind) of something in the classics. 'The selections,' we are informed, 'have been made for the reader who is interested primarily in English poetry, and has "small Latin and less Greek."' It is however only the reader who knows the classical originals to whom this book could be of the slightest use. The text gives no indication whatever why any poem has been inserted. To know this one must turn to the notes and read 'After Meleager,' 'From Lucilius,' 'After Paul the Silentiary,' etc. No information is given about these writers, and the poems which are supposed to reflect them are arranged with a delightful disregard of order, Greek and Latin poets of all ages and schools being thrown at the reader higgledy-piggledy. We may remark *en passant* that Drummond's sonnet 'Sleep, Silence' child,' here called 'an echo of Statius *Silv.* v. iv.' has been shown by Mr Kastner to be a fairly close following of a sonnet by Marino. But though Mr Leonard is generally jejune, he is at times fresh and frank enough. His note to the line 'But I a looking-glass would be' (which he attributes to 'M. B. Holliday') runs '*Holliday.* After Anacreon. Quoted by Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, but that is all I know of him.' If Mr Leonard had recognised 'M.' as the seventeenth century abbreviation of 'Mr,' he would probably have opined that the lines were by Barten Holyday, Burton's contemporary at Christ Church. In his last note, the editor tells us that Hood's lines:

> My temples throb, my pulses boil,
> I'm sick of Song, and Ode, and Ballad...
> Then Pallas take away thine Owl,
> And let us have a lark instead.

represent 'the anthologist's feelings at the conclusion of his arduous task.' We trust that he has by this time had his lark, and that when he turns to another task, it will be one which he can take seriously.

G. C. M. S.

We welcome Mr A. J. Barnouw's edition of the Middle Dutch legend *Beatrijs*, which has been published as volume III of the Publications of the Philological Society (Oxford: University Press, 1914), as a helpful aid to the English student who wishes to gain some knowledge of

Middle Dutch. Perhaps, indeed, Mr Barnouw might have found a wider public for his work, had he issued it, not as an edition of a particular poem, but as a Grammar of Middle Dutch with the *Beatrijs* legend as an illustrative specimen. From the present title one might not infer that the book contains an excellent introduction to the language of some 46 pages, similar to those in the *Old High German* and *Middle High German Primers* which the Oxford Press has published for Professor Wright. The poem itself has considerable literary interest and is printed from the unique MS. in the Hague Library. Mr Barnouw's notes are rather elementary in character, and might have been supplemented by some on the relation of the poem to its source and to parallel versions of the story. As an introduction, however, to Middle Dutch, the book is admirably adapted to its purpose.

Dr L. A. Willoughby's study on *Samuel Naylor and 'Reynard the Fox'* (Oxford: University Press, 1914) is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the group of Englishmen who formed a link between this country and Weimar in the early nineteenth century. With painstaking research Dr Willoughby has collected a multitude of interesting details of Naylor's life—notably concerning his relations to that *grande amoureuse* of Weimar, Goethe's daughter-in-law Ottilie. Although like most of this circle, Naylor was but a literary dilettante, his translation of the old *Reineke Vos* of Hinrik van Alkmer is, as is to be seen from Dr Willoughby's account of it, a spirited piece of work and well worthy of resuscitation in one of our modern libraries of reprints. To his study of Naylor Dr Willoughby has added a few all too brief notes on the general history of *Reynard the Fox* in England; but it is a subject that would well repay more detailed study.

J. G. R.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

April—November, 1915.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Italian.

ALIGHIERI, J., Chiose alla cantica dell' Inferno di Dante Alighieri. Florence, R. Bemporad. 18 L.

ARIOSTO, L., Le opere minori, scelte e commentate da G. Fatini. Florence, G. C. Sansoni. 3 L.

BARBI, M., Studi sul Canzoniere di Dante. Florence, G. C. Sansoni. 20 L.

BENEDETTI, A., L' Orlando Furioso nella vita intellettuale del popolo inglese. Florence, R. Bemporad. 4 L. 50.

BERTOLI, L., La fortuna del Petrarca in Francia nella prima metà del XIX secolo. Livorno, R. Giusti. 3 L.

CAMPANELLA, T., Poesie, a cura di G. Gentile. (Scrittori d' Italia, LXX.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

CECCHERELLI, E., G. B. Zannoni, con speciale riguardo ai suoi scherzi comici e al teatro vernacolo fiorentino. Florence, R. Bemporad. 2 L. 50.

CHATFIELD-TAYLOR, H. C., Goldoni: a Biography. London, Chatto and Windus. 16*s.* net.

CROCE, B., Aneddoti e profili settecenteschi. Palermo, R. Sandron. 3 L. 50.

CROCE, B., Scritti di storia letteraria e politica. V. La letteratura della nuova Italia: saggi critici. Vol. III. Bari, G. Laterza. 6 L. 50.

DANTE ALIGHIERI, The Divine Comedy. Translated by H. Johnson. London, H. Milford. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

DANTE ALIGHIERI, The Paradise of. Translated by C. L. Shadwell. London, Macmillan. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

FALCUCCI, F. D., Vocabolario dei dialetti, geografia e costumi della Corsica. Cagliari, Società storica sarda. 12 L.

FLAMINI, F., Il significato e il fine della Divina Commedia. I. 2a ed. Livorno, Giusti. 5 L.

GIUBBINI, A., Il 'dolce stil nuovo' di A. Manzoni. Rome, E. Loescher. 3 L.

LENTINO, G. DA, The Poetry of, Sicilian poet of the 13th century. Ed. by E. F. Langley (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages). London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

MAZZINI, G., Scritti scelti, con introduzione e commento di C. Cantinori. Milan, F. Vallardi. 3 L. 50.

Meli, G., Poesie, secondo l' edizione definitiva del 1814, a cura di F. Rampolla. 2 vols. Palermo, A. Reber. 5 L.

Meozzi, A., Il Carducci umanista: studio critico. Parte I. Sansepolcro, S. Boncompagni. 3 L. 50.

Modi, J. J., Dante Papers: Virâf, Adamnan and Dante, and other Papers. London, Luzac. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Molmenti, P., Epistolari veneziani del sec. XVIII. Palermo, R. Sandron. 3 L.

Muratori, L. A., Epistolario, edito da M. Càmpori. XIII. Modena, Società Tip. Modenese. 12 L.

Passerini, G. L., Il vocabolario pascoliano. Florence, Sansoni. 5 L.

Petrarch, F., Some Love Songs. Translated with a biographical introduction by W. D. Foulke. London, H. Milford. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Pietrobono, L., Il poema sacro: saggio d' una interpretazione generale della Divina Commedia. I, II. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. 6 L.

Sainati, A., La lirica di Torquato Tasso. Parte II. Pisa, E. Spoerri. 6 L.

Vossler, C., Letteratura italiana contemporanea. Trad. di T. Gnoli. Naples, Ricciardi. 2 L. 50.

Spanish.

Cejador y Frauca, J., Historia de la lengua y literatura castellana, desde los orígenes hasta Carlos V. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 10 pes.

Cervantes, M. de, Entremeses. Edición rev. por L. C. Viada y Lluch. Barcelona, E. Domenech. 3 pes.

Cervantes, M. de, Obras completas. Tomos I—V. Edición publ. por R. Schevill y A. Bonilla. Madrid, B. Rodriguez. Each 10 pes.

Cotarelo y Mori, E., Don Diego de Enciso y su teatro. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 2 pes.

González del Castillo, J. I., Obras completas. Tomos II, III. (Bibl. selecta de clásicos españoles.) Madrid, Suc. de Hernando.

Gracian, L., El Criticón. Tomo II. Edición transcrita y revisada por J. Cejador y Frauca. Madrid, 2 pes. 50.

Krüger, F., Studien zur Lautgeschichte westspanischer Mundarten auf Grund von Untersuchungen an Ort und Stelle (Mitteilungen und Abhandlungen. Hamburger Seminar für romanische Sprache und Kultur, II). Hamburg, C. Gräfe und Sillem. 15 M.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M., Historia de la poesía castellana de la Edad media. Edición ordenada y anotada por A. Bonilla y San Martin. Tomo II. Madrid, Fortanet. 10 pes.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M., Orígenes de la novela. Tomo IV. (Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, XXI.) Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 12 pes.

Pérez Pastor, C., Noticias y documentos relativos a la historia y literatura española. II. Madrid, Suc. de Hernando. 8 pes.

Post, C. R., Mediæval Spanish Allegory (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, IV). Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Romancero de Amor. Colección de romances castellanos, de índole amorosa, anterior al siglo XVIII, recogidos y ordenados. (Bibl. de Clásicos selectos.) Barcelona, Comas y Portarella. 2 pes. 50.

French.

Benedetto, L. F., Madame de Warens d'après de nouveaux documents. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 3 fr. 50.

Bithell, J., Contemporary Belgian Literature. Lendon, T. Fisher Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Bossuet, J. B., Correspondance. Nouv. édit. par C. Urbain et E. Lévesque. Tome ix. (Collection des Grands Écrivains de la France.) Paris, Hachette. 7 fr. 50.

Clark, M., M. Maeterlinck, poet and philosopher. London, Allen and Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Falke, E., Die romantischen Elemente in Prosper Mérimées Roman und Novellen. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 6 M.

Foulet, L., A Bibliography of Medieval French Literature for College Libraries, ed. by A. Schinz and G. A. Underwood. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford.

George, W. L., Anatole France. (Writers of the Day.) London, Nisbet. 1*s.* net.

Lamartine, A. M. L. de, Méditations poétiques. Nouv. éd. avec introduction, notices et notes par G. Lanson. (Les Grands Écrivains de la France, II^e série.) 2 vols. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Latham, A. G., The Oxford Treasury of French Literature. i. Mediæval, Renaissance, and Seventeenth Century. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Michaelis, G., Die sogenannten 'comédies espagnoles' de Thomas Corneille, ihr Verhältnis zu den spanischen Vorlagen. Berlin, E. Ebering. 9 M.

Rudnitzki, P., Der Turnierroman 'Livre des faits du bon chevalier messire Jacques de Lalaing.' (Forschungen und Funde, iv, 1.) Munich, Aschendorff. 4 M.

Stewart, H. F., The Holiness of Pascal. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 4*s.* net.

Stimming, E., Der Accusativus cum Infinitivo im Französischen. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für roman. Philologie, lix.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 9 M.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

Bolander, C. A., Svenska diktare just nu. Litterära essayer. Stockholm, Björck och Börjesson. 3 kr. 50.

Brieskorn, R., Bidrag till den svenska namnhistorien. ii. Medeltida tillnamn. (Uppsala Universitets Aarsskrift, 1915, ii.) Uppsala, Akad. bokh. 3 kr.

Campbell, O. J., The Comedies of Holberg (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, iii). Cambridge, Mass.; London, H. Milford. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Danske Grammatikere fra Midten af det syttende til Midten af det attende Aarhundrede. Udg. af H. Bertelsen. i. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr.

Ewald, J., Samlede Skrifter, udgivne af H. Brix og V. Kuhr, ii. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr. 25.

Grønborg, J., P. A. Heiberg og hans Hustru. Aarhus, A. Bayer. 2 kr. 25.

Holberg, L., Comedies: Jeppe of the Hill; The Political Tinker; Erasmus Montanus. Translated by O. J. Campbell and F. Schenck (Scandinavian Classics). London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Holberg, L., Samlede Skrifter. Udg. af C. S. Petersen. iii, xix, 3. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 23 kr. 65.

Kalkar, O., Ordbog til det ældre danske Sprog (1300–1700). 56. og 57. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Reitzel. Each 2 kr. 50.

Möller, H., Henrik Wergeland. Christiania, Gad. 5 L.

Overskou, Th., Af mit Liv og min Tid (1797–1818). Udg. af R. Neiiendam. Copenhagen, Pio. 3 kr. 50.

Palladius, P., Danske Skrifter. Udg. af L. Jacobsen. 6.—8. Lev. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 8 kr. 85.

Rosenberg, P. A., B. Bjørnson. (Folkets Førere.) Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 1 kr. 25.

Rydberg, V., Skrifter, III. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 2 kr. 75.

Schück, H. och K. Warburg, Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria. 2a. uppl. IV, 1. Stockholm, H. Geber. 12 kr.

Snorre Sturlason, Heimskringla: The Olaf Sagas. Transl. by S. Laing (Everyman's Library). London, J. M. Dent. 1*s.* net.

Strindberg, A., Samlade Skrifter. XXX, XXXI. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 1 kr. 75; 3 kr. 25.

Tegnér, E., Poems. The Children of the Lord's Supper, transl. by H. W. Longfellow; Frithiof's Saga, transl. by W. L. Blackley. (Scandinavian Classics.) London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Torp, A., Nynorsk etymologisk ordbok. 1.—8. Hefte. Christiania, H. Aschehoug. Each 1 kr. 50.

Vinje, A. O., Skrifter i Samling. 1. Hefte. Christiania, J. W. Cappelen. 45 øre.

English.

(*a*) *General (incl. Language).*

Johnston, J. B., The Place-names of England and Wales. London, J. Murray. 15*s.* net.

Oxford English Dictionary, The. Vol. IX. Spring—Squoyle by W. A. Craigie; St—Stead, by H. Bradley. Vol. X. Trink—Turn-down, by Sir J. A. H. Murray. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*, 5*s.*, 5*s.*

Sedgefield, W. J., The Place-names of Cumberland and Westmorland. London, Longmans, Green. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wilson, Sir J., Lowland Scotch as spoken in the Lower Strathearn District of Perthshire. Oxford, Univ. Press. 5*s.* net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Bryan, W. F., Studies in the Dialect of the Kentish Charters of the Old English Period. Chicago Diss. Menascha, Wis., G. Banta.

Chambers, R. W. and W. W. Seton, A Fifteenth-century Courtesy Book, and two Fifteenth-century Franciscan Rules (Philological Society). London, H. Milford. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Chaucer, G., The Nonnë Prestes Tale. Edited by L. Winstanley. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2*s.*

Edmunds, E. W., Chaucer and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

Emerson, O. F., Middle English Reader. New Ed. London, Macmillan. 6*s.* net.

Heidrich, K., Das geographische Weltbild des späteren englischen Mittelalters mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Vorstellungen Chaucers und seiner Zeitgenossen. Diss. Freiburg i. B., Hammerschlag und Kahle.

KENNEDY, A. G., The Pronoun of Address in English Literature of the Thirteenth Century. Stanford University, Cal.

KIER, Chr., Beowulf. Et Bidrag til Nordens Oldhistorie. Christiania, Thaning og Appel. 3 kr.

KITTREDGE, G. L., Chaucer and his Poetry. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

OLIVERO, F., Traduzioni dalla Poesia anglo-sassone. Con Introduzione e note. Bari, G. Laterza. 4 L.

Parlement of the Thre Ages, The. (Select Early English Poems, ed. by I. Gollancz, II.) London, H. Milford. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROLLE, R., of Hampole. Incendium Amoris. Ed. by M. Deanesley. London, Longmans, Green. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

SKEAT, W. W., The Lay of Havelok the Dane. Re-edited from MS. Laud Misc. 108 in the Bodleian Library. 2nd ed., rev. by K. Sisam. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4*s.* 6*d.*

(*c*) *Modern English.*

ADDISON, J., Miscellaneous Works, ed. by A. E. Guthkelch, II. London, G. Bell. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

BAILEY, J., Milton. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s.* net.

BINNS, H. B., Walt Whitman and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

CANNAN, G., Samuel Butler: a critical Study. London, M. Secker. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

CHEW, S. C., The Dramas of Lord Byron. A Critical Study. (Hesperia, Supplementary Series, III.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 6 M.

COHEN, H. L., The Ballade. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Common Conditions, ed. by Tucker Brooke from the copy in the Library of the Elizabethan Club of Yale University (Elizabethan Club Reprints, I). New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

COURTNEY, W. P., Bibliography of Johnson, rev. by D. Nichol Smith. (Oxford Historical and Literary Studies.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

DOLBEN, D. M., Poems. Edited with a Memoir by R. Bridges. London, H. Milford. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

DURHAM, W. H., Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, 1700–1725. London, H. Milford. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

FINDLAY, J. P., Sir Walter Scott, the great unknown. London, J. Nimmo. 1*s.* net.

FREEBURG, V. O., Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama. A Study in Stage Tradition (Columbia Univ. Studies in English and Comparative Literature). New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford.

FREY, E., Der Einfluss der englischen, französischen, italienischen und lateinischen Literatur auf die Dichtungen Matthew Priors. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 5 M.

GRAVES, T. S., The 'Act-Time' in Elizabethan Theatres (Univ. of North Carolina Studies in Philology, XII, 3). Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

GREENWOOD, C. G., Is there a Shakespeare problem? With a reply to Mr J. M. Robertson and Mr Andrew Lang. London, J. Lane. 16*s.* net.

GREGORY, A., The French Revolution and the English Novel. London, G. Putnam. 7*s.* 6*d.*

HERRICK, R., Poetical Works. Ed. by F. W. Moorman. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

INGRAM, J. W., Marlowe and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

JONSON, B., A Tale of a Tub. Edited by F. M. Snell. London, Longmans, Green. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

KAY, T., The Story of the 'Grafton' portrait of William Shakespeare. London, Partridge. 5*s.* net.

KEATS, J., Poems. Arranged in chronological order with a Preface by Sir S. Colvin. London, Chatto and Windus. 21*s.* net.

KING, H., Bishop of Chichester. English Poems. Now first collected by L. Mason. London, H. Milford. 6*s.* net.

LANDOR, W. S., Imaginary Conversations : a selection. With Introduction by E. de Sélincourt. (World's Classics.) London, H. Milford. 1*s.* net.

LEE, SIR SIDNEY, Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance (Brit. Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture). London, H. Milford. 1*s.* net.

MATTHEWS, B., The Oxford Book of American Essays. London, H. Milford. 5*s.* net.

PIERCE, F. E., Selections from the Symbolical Poems of William Blake. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

PURVES, J., The South African Book of English Verse. London, Longmans, Green and Co. 3*s.* 6*d.*

REID, F., W. B. Yeats : a critical study. London, M. Necker. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

RICHARDSON, G. F., A Neglected Aspect of the English Romantic Revolt (Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, III, 3). Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press.

ROUTH, J., The Rise of Classical English Criticism. New Orleans, Tulane Univ. Press.

ROY, J. A., Cowper and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life Series.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

SÉLINCOURT, E. DE, English Poets and the national ideal : four lectures. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

SHELLEY, P. B., Letters, containing material never before collected. Edited by Roger Ingpen. New ed. 2 vols. London, G. Bell. 10*s.*

TUBBE, H., Selections, ed. from the MSS. by G. C. Moore Smith. (Oxford Historical and Literary Studies.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

TUPPER, F. and J. W., Representative English Dramas from Dryden to Sheridan. London, H. Milford. 5*s.* net.

VAUGHAN, HENRY, The Works of, ed. by L. C. Martin, 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 18*s.* net.

WARDE, F., The Fools of Shakespeare : an Interpretation of their wit, wisdom and personalities. London, McBride. 5*s.* net.

WHEELER, C. B., Six Plays by Contemporaries of Shakespeare. London, H. Milford. 1*s.* net. (World's Classics.)

WORDSWORTH, W., The Patriotic Poetry of. A selection ed. by A. H. D. Acland. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1*s.* net.

WORDSWORTH, W., Tract on the Convention of Cintra (1809), ed. by A. V. Dicey. (Oxford Library of Prose and Poetry.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Brand, J., Studie zur Dialektgeographie des Hochstiftes Paderborn und der Abtei Corvey. (Forschungen und Funde, iv, 1.) Munich, Aschendorff. 1 M. 25.

Fischer, W., Die deutsche Sprache von heute (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 475). Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M. 25.

Hausenklas, A., Grammatik der nordwestböhmischen Mundart. (Beiträge zur Kenntnis deutsch-böhmischer Mundarten, ii.) Prague, Calve. 4 kr.

Hodler, W., Beiträge zur Wortbildung und Wortbedeutung im Berndeutschen. (Sprache und Dichtung, xvi.) Berne, A. Francke. 5 fr.

Naumann, H., Kurze historische Syntax der deutschen Sprache. (Trübners Philologische Bibliothek, ii.) Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 2 M.

Schmid, K., Die Mundart des Amtes Entlebuch im Kanton Luzern. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik, vii.) Frauenfeld, Huber und Co. 12 fr. 50.

Wrede, F., Deutsche Dialektgeographie: Berichte und Studien über G. Wenkers Sprachatlas des Deutschen Reiches. Heft iv, viii. Marburg, Elwert. 11 M. 50.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Collinson, W. E., Die Katharinenlegende der Hs. ii. 143 der kgl. Bibliothek zu Brüssel, herausg. (Germanische Bibliothek ii; Untersuchungen und Texte, x.) Heidelberg, C. Winter.

Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters. xxv. Die Pilgerfahrt des träumenden Mönchs. Herausg. von A. Bömer. xxviii. Lucidarius aus der Berliner Hs. herausg. von F. Heidlauf. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 M. 60; 4 M. 60.

Getzuhn, K., Untersuchungen zum Sprachgebrauch und Wortschatz der Klage. (Germanistiche Arbeiten, ii.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 5 M.

Hirsch, A., Die deutschen Prosabearbeitungen der Legende vom heiligen Ulrich. (Münchener Archiv für Philologie des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, iv.) Munich, G. D. O. Callwey. 7 M. 50.

Meyer, O. R., Der Borte des Dietrich von der Glazze. Untersuchungen und Text. (Germanistische Arbeiten, iii.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 40.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Adler, F. H., Herder and Klopstock: a Comparative Study. New York, G. E. Stechert. 1 dol. 50.

Bode, W., Die Franzosen und Engländer in Goethes Leben und Urteil. (From 'Stunden mit Goethe.') Berlin, Mittler und Sohn. 2 M.

Böhm, F. J., Gedenkblätter an L. Anzengruber. Breslau, Schottländer. 3 M. 50.

Brandes, G., Wolfgang Goethe. 2 vols. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 11 kr. 60.

Brauweiler, E., Heines Prosa. Beiträge zu ihrer Wesensbestimmung. (Bonner Forschungen, ix.) Berlin, Grote. 4 M.

Carus, P., Goethe with special consideration of his Philosophy. Chicago, Open Court Publ. Co. 3 dol.

Coffman, B. R., The Influence of English Literature on F. von Hagedorn. i—iii. (From 'Modern Philology.') Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press.

Fortunatus. Nach dem Augsburger Druck von 1509, herausg. von Gunther. (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrh., No. 240–1.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 20.

Gabetti, G., Le affinità elettive del Goethe come espressione di una crisi pessimistica. Milan, Studio editor. Lombardo. 3 L.

Germann, R., Wielands Gandalin. (Probefahrten, xxvi.) Leipzig, R. Voigtländer. 2 M. 40.

Goethe-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der. ii. Bd. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 5 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Briefwechsel mit Zelter, herausg. von M. Hecker. ii. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 6 M. 50.

Grimm, J. und W., Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen. Neu bearbeitet von J. Bolte und G. Polívka. ii. Leipzig, Dieterich. 12 M.

Heine, H., Sämtliche Werke. x. Band. Herausg. von A. Leitzmann. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 2 M.

Hill, W., Die deutschen Theaterzeitschriften des 18. Jahrhunderts. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, xlix.) Weimar, Duncker. 8 M.

Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte. xxiv. Bd. i. Berlin-Steglitz, B. Behr. 13 M.

Krafft, E., Das 'Speculum Mundi' des Bartholomäus Ringwaldt, sprachlich, textkritisch, literarhistorisch untersucht. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, xlvii.) 5 M. 60.

Möser, J., Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von H. Schierbaum. i. Munich, G. Müller. 7 M. 50.

Price, L. M., The Attitude of G. Freytag and J. Schmidt towards English Literature, 1848–62. (Hesperia, vii.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 3 M. 60.

Roessler, E. W., The Soliloquy in German Drama. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol.

Rudwin, M. J., Der Teufel in den deutschen geistlichen Spielen des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 7 M.

Saran, F., Goethes Mahomet und Prometheus. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Sarter, E., Zur Technik von Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahren. (Bonner Forschungen, vii.) Berlin, G. Grote. 2 M. 20.

Visconti, L., La pedagogia del romanticismo tedesco. Milan, Soc. editr. Dante Alighieri. 3 L.

Vogel, P., Das Bildungsideal der deutschen Frühromantik. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M. 40.

Wahl, H., Geschichte der Teutschen Merkur. (Palaestra, cxxvii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 7 M. 50.

Zabeltitz, M. Z. von, Georg Büchner, sein Leben und sein Schaffen. (Bonner Forschungen, viii.) Berlin, G. Grote. 4 M.

ISOCRATES AND EUPHUISM[1].

III.

IT has long been recognised that the euphuistic figures had made their appearance in England by the turn of the century; Lord Berners and Sir Thomas More, to name only two, had used them before 1550, although the full euphuistic formula was not developed until somewhat later. Therefore in our search for their source we need concern ourselves only with the first half of the century. We must not underestimate the compass of the prose produced in that period. We must not forget that the thin trickle of humanistic writing, though to us it more or less represents early sixteenth-century literature, was but a portion of the total literary output. By the middle of the century humanism had produced in vernacular prose only Sir Thomas More's English works, Sir Thomas Elyot's writings, Ascham's *Toxophilus*, and a few minor books. On the other hand the bulk of the literature is more popular in tone—sermons, and pamphlets controversial and exhortatory, written by men who were aiming at a large audience, who were using the style which had the widest appeal, who in fact were in no sense classicists, and neither desirous nor able to imitate a Greek style in English prose.

Now while it has been remarked again and again that the humanists used the euphuistic figures, it has not been so generally observed that the preachers and pamphleteers show no less thorough a familiarity with them[2]. Moreover, not only do they show themselves well acquainted

[1] Concluded from p. 27.

[2] Wendelstein, Ludwig, *Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Euphuismus*, Halle, 1902. In this thesis Wendelstein has traced the early history of the euphuistic figures of sound, *i.e.* alliteration, homoioteleuton, paromoion; though he has not given so much attention to the schemes of structure, such as parison, or to the many non-Gorgianic schemes, such as the numerous kinds of repetition, he has nevertheless succeeded in showing the universal knowledge of formal rhetoric in the sixteenth century so conclusively that I can simply refer readers to his thesis. The quotations assembled in his footnotes are particularly instructive.

with the Gorgianic figures, which after all comprise only four out of a great number of schemes, but they all, humanists and pamphleteers alike, show that they know equally well the whole body of formal rhetoric; they use all the dozen or more varieties of repetition and all the other schemes, as well as the four Gorgian or euphuistic figures. Thomas Wilson tells us as much in *The Arte of Rhetorique* when he says:

Concerning homoioteleuton:

> Some end their sentences all alike, making their talke rather to appeare rimed Meeter, then to seeme plaine speeche, the which as it much deliteth being measurably vsed, so it much offendeth when no meane is regarded. I heard a preacher deliting much in this kind of composition, who vsed so often to end his sentences with wordes like vnto that which went before, that in my iudgement there was not a dosen sentences in his whole sermon, but they ended all in Rime for the most parte[1].

Again:

> Diuers in this our time delite much in this kinde of writing, which beeing measurably vsed, deliteth much the hearers, otherwise it offendeth, and wearieth mens eares with sacietie. S. Augustine had a goodly gift in this behalfe, and yet some thinkes he forgot measure, and vsed ouermuch this kind of figure....So that for the flowing stile and full sentence, crept in Minstrels elocution, talking matters altogether in rime; etc.[2]

Of repetition he says:

> Some repeate one worde so often, that if such wordes could be eaten, and chopt in so oft as they are vttered out, they would choke the widest throte in al England[3].

And of alliteration:

> Some vse ouermuch repetition of some one letter, as pitifull pouertie praieth for a penie, etc.[3]

When once we have realised that the entire subject of formal rhetoric was matter of common knowledge in the sixteenth century, it becomes impossible to attribute this knowledge to the study of any one classical author, for we see that the schemes are used by men who cannot have taken the slightest interest in the prose style of ancient Greece or Rome, who must have had 'little Latin and less Greek.' For if we are to arrive at any result at all, we must distinguish between those who were classicists and those who were not; and this is what most students of euphuism have forgotten to do. On the contrary they have assumed that wherever the Gorgian figures are found they are of classical origin and due to direct imitation of the classics. They make no distinction between humanist and pamphleteer, classical

[1] Wilson, p. 168. [2] Wilson, p. 203. [3] Wilson, p. 167.

teachers and preachers, *littérateurs* by profession and religious controversialists. But the fact which must be firmly grasped is that humanism was still very new in England in the first half of the sixteenth century; it was exotic; it flourished in small coteries of the universities and the court.

In particular is this true of the study of Greek. It was little taught in the schools before 1560. To quote Foster Watson: 'Indeed, from a consideration of all the facts, it seems clear that the study of Greek in any way bearing directly on school practice had no strong hold on the English schools before the return of the English refugees from Switzerland, after the Marian persecution[1].' It seems not to have been taught in over half-a-dozen schools all told, before 1558.

Greek came somewhat earlier to the universities, but even in them it was not firmly established before 1540, when the Regius professorships were founded. This date in fact marks the turning-point in university education. As Dr J. Bass Mullinger says in *Social England*: 'Simultaneously with the disappearance of the monks and the friars, the universities witnessed a complete revolution in the ancient system of instruction. Cromwell's commissioners appeared both at Oxford and at Cambridge, and formally expelled the schoolmen and their commentators alike from the colleges and from the schools[2].' Each college was required to maintain 'two daily public lectures, the one of Greek, the other of Latin.' In 1542 Ascham wrote the letter to Brandesby in which he dilates on the new enthusiasm for Greek, showing not only how high, but also how recent, it was[3].

It is well to keep in mind how limited humanism was, particularly knowledge of Greek, during the first part of the century. In literature addressed to the crowd humanistic influence must count for virtually nothing at all, and certainly it would be impossible to try to trace so universal a thing as the passion for rhetoric and the knowledge of it to the reading of a single Greek author.

For the point that needs to be emphasised again and again is that the knowledge of formal rhetoric was far too widespread to be derived from this or that classical author—unless it be Quintilian, because he wrote the manual of rhetoric *par excellence* and because all later manuals were based directly or indirectly on his. The source of this knowledge is to be found in the place where we should naturally look

[1] Watson, *l.c.*, p. 490.
[2] *Social England*, ed. H. D. Traill, New York, 1902, vol. III, pp. 92–3.
[3] Ascham, *l.c.*, vol. I, p. 26.

for it: the schools. The shift of emphasis in education from logic to rhetoric at the time of the Renaissance is a commonplace. This influence has not gone unnoticed. Foster Watson says: 'Unless the school and university training in rhetoric are borne in mind, an important factor in accounting for the wealth of imagery and expression in the English literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is overlooked[1].' And in his introduction to Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* G. H. Mair writes: 'The practice and study of rhetoric was quickly universal and coloured all literature. The new drama, with its preference for declamatory speeches over dialogue; the new prose, with its fantasy and its exuberance of figure; the new poetry, with its mythological allusiveness and its sensuousness of imagery, all owe their origin to the fashion of rhetoric[2].'...'The historians tell us that euphuism is older than *Euphues*, but they have failed to notice that the English study of rhetoric provides a much better indication of its origin than do the imagined influences of Italy and Spain[3].'

However, not only was education centred on rhetoric, but the study of rhetoric was focussed on the figures. That is why Quintilian must be accepted as the most representative classical author of the period, and we could add that he was the most influential also, were it not that the rhetorics in actual use were almost always mere mediaeval or early Renaissance manuals in which very little of the real classical spirit of Quintilian had survived the countless processes of filtration. Of these textbooks the most popular were Mosellanus's *Figurae* and Susenbrotus's *Epitome Troporum et Schematum*, in which the figures were classified and the use of them exemplified, while the rest of Quintilian was disregarded.

Furthermore, this centring of rhetorical study on the figures was not only the last phase of Roman education and the first of the Renaissance, but it was also the universal characteristic of elementary rhetorical training in mediaeval times. It is true of course that logic overshadowed all other branches of learning and that rhetoric had sunk to a comparatively obscure position. But it was never abandoned, and the very part that was retained was the classification of tropes and schemes, which the mediaeval students memorised[4]. Therefore even at the beginning of the sixteenth century, before Renaissance education had begun, educated men were familiar with these figures; all that was

[1] Watson, *l.c.*, p. 452.
[2] Wilson, Intro. p. xvii.
[3] Wilson, Intro. p. xxvi.
[4] See Abelson, Paul, *The Seven Liberal Arts*, New York, 1906.

needed was an incentive to use them. However much the classical revival may have helped in furnishing this incentive, the fact remains that we cannot attribute the knowledge of rhetoric to the new humanistic study of the classics; neither the way in which rhetoric was taught nor the manner of using this knowledge was governed by the classical spirit.

This widespread study of the rhetorical figures explains as nothing else will why it is that all the writers of the sixteenth century use all the schemes, both the Gorgian and the non-Gorgian. Norden's statement that Englishmen became acquainted with the Gorgian figures through Isocrates and that these schemes were developed progressively through More, Elyot, Ascham, and so on up to Lyly cannot be accepted when once we have realised that the whole bulk of formal rhetoric was matter of common knowledge at the time. It is impossible to single out a few authors and say that because they have some things in common with Isocrates they must have learned these things from him; such a statement rests upon the assumptions that the other writers of the period did not know these schemes, and that the other schemes were not known at all—both radically false assumptions. It is, as I said before, a matter of background; and the necessary background for a study of sixteenth-century styles is the knowledge that all the schemes were generally known and used. The thing to do in studying any given author is to observe which schemes he prefers and how he uses them.

IV.

Before the peculiarities which mark an author's style can be determined and the questions of influence answered, it is necessary to establish the norm or dead level of English prose from 1500 to 1550 approximately, for it is only the variations from the norm that have significance. The style must be defined, therefore, which was used by the men who were not conscious stylists, who were not trying to introduce innovations, but on the other hand to make the strongest possible appeal to the widest audience. We find this dead level in the popular pamphlets of the time.

These pamphleteers put forth all their efforts in the use of schemes; and evidently counting on such tricks as a great attraction, they were most fond of the most obvious varieties, those which involve sound: alliteration, rhyme, paromoion, paronomasia. That is, so far from trying

to subordinate these figures, they make them on the contrary as prominent as possible. The natural result of this attitude was that they paid little attention to the larger question of sentence-structure. Their phrases and clauses are short and jerking. Except for a sort of continual snapping they have no rhythm. They do not care for balance except for the purpose of heightening the figures which depend on sound. Smoothness, polish, flowing rhythms, and restraint are not among their ideals[1].

We are now in a position to see what Elyot, Ascham, and Wilson were trying to accomplish, and how far they succeeded. They were all three good classicists, and from the study of ancient prose, especially that of Cicero and Isocrates, they had derived no mean sense of artistic style. They did not, of course, any more than Isocrates, or Cicero in his youth, reject the schemes altogether. But they exalted purity of diction, smoothness, polish, and elegance, 'the full sentence and flowing style,' and they maintained that the schemes should be subordinated to these higher qualities. They preferred the figures which do not involve sound-similarities, isocolon, and balance and antithesis unpointed by alliteration or rime, to the more obvious schemes, such as homoioteleuton, paromoion, or paronomasia. In short, they wished to make a silk purse out of the sow's ear of the common style of their day. Wilson has given the fullest expression to this ideal. Figures, he says, are good so long as they are used in moderation; diction should be smooth and clear; and rhythm is the highest quality of style. In short, the ideal which he sets up is really the Isocratic, though he nowhere comments on this fact, and I should say that it was as likely to be due to his general study of rhetorical principles as to his reading of the Athenian orator.

However, in the case of Elyot we know that he did deliberately mould his style on Isocrates. He was a stylist, particularly interested in introducing classic style into English. Consequently, as one would

[1] See Wendelstein's *Vorgeschichte des Euphuismus* referred to above, p. 129, n. 2. As illustrations of this common style I cite the following:

'These be thei whiche professyng knowledge, abuse the ignoraunce of the nobilitie and commonaltie, to ye destruccion of bothe, hauyng peace in their mouthes, and all rancor and vengeaunce in their hartes, pretendyng religion, perswade rebellion, preachyng obedience, procure al disobedience, semyng to forsake all thyng, possesse all thyng, callyng themselfes spirituall, are in deede moste carnall, and reputed heddes of the Churche, bee the onely shame and slaunder of the Churche.' *The Exhortacioun of James Harrysone, Scottisheman* (1547), E. E. T. S. (E. S.) 17, 18, p. 209.

'...yet here wee proteste and declare to you, and all Christian people, to be the kynges Maiesties mynd, our Masters, by our aduise and counsaill, not to conquer, but to haue in amitie, not to wynne by force, but to conciliate by loue, not to spoyle and kil, but to saue and kepe, not to disseuer and diuorce, but to ioyne in mariage from high to low, bothe the realmes, to make of one Isle one realme, in loue, amitie, concorde, peace, and Charitie.' *The Epistle of the Lord Protector Somerset* (1548), E. E. T. S. (E. S.) 17, 18, p. 241.

expect, he is remarkably subdued in his use of schemes, and he approximates the Isocratic rhythm. He avoids non-Isocratic figures almost, but not quite, entirely. His writing affords enough instances of repetition to show that he has not altogether freed himself from current usage, although his style shows Isocratic influence in that the schemes are comparatively infrequent, consist chiefly of isocolon and parison, are subordinated, and the rhythms are smooth and long and flowing.

Ascham's case is similar; he too has used Isocrates to free himself from the worst faults of his age. And yet in the *Toxophilus*, intended more or less to catch the public ear, we find the following: '...but seeing with wishing we cannot have one now worthy, which so worthy a thing can worthily praise, and although I had rather have any other to do it than myself, yet myself rather than no other, I will not fail to say in it what I can[1].' Even Ascham is not entirely emancipated; but as a rule he deserves the praise which his admirer Harvey bestowed upon him. Such a sentence as this, for example, has something of the Isocratic ring: 'No, I will never so return thither again, to spend my age there in need and care, where I led my youth in plenty and hope, but will follow rather Isocrates' counsel, to get me thither where I am less known, there to live, though not with less care, at least with less shame[2].' Here we have the utmost of precise and involved balance, but none of the exact euphuistic similarities of sound. From Isocrates he has learned that the chief virtues of style are smoothness, clarity, restraint, and that the schemes of structure—isocolon and parison—are to be preferred to those which depend on the chime of like sounds.

To sum up the matter, I think that Isocrates did have an appreciable influence on English prose, in the persons of a few humanists, of whom Elyot and Ascham were the most important, but that his influence, short-lived as it was, ran directly counter to the tendency which culminated in *Euphues*. Isocrates explains the differences between Ascham and Lyly—but not the similarities. For Lyly, as I pointed out at the beginning, evidently had an ideal of prose style quite opposed to the Isocratic, and those minor elements which the two men have in common are accounted for as the common property of the sixteenth century.

T. K. WHIPPLE.

PRINCETON, N.J., U.S.A.

[1] Ascham, vol. III, p. 16.

[2] Ascham, *l.c.*, vol. II, p. 399.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF 'THE TWO NOBLE KINSMEN.'

FEW questions have evoked more discussion than that of the authorship of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, attributed on the title page of the first edition of 1634 to the 'memorable worthies of their time, Mr John Fletcher and Mr William Shakespeare.' The believers in Shakespeare's part-authorship of this play include not only some of the most famous names in literature, but some of the most learned and acute Shakespearean scholars, such as Dyce, Furnivall and Hudson who have admitted it into their editions of the Stratford poet's works. Of recent years, however, the attitude of most critics has been one of neutrality, inclining to scepticism. This scepticism was undoubtedly accentuated by Mr Robert Boyle's extremely able advocacy of Massinger's claims to the authorship of the scenes attributed to Shakespeare in his paper published in the *Transactions* of the New Shakspere Society for 1882, and it is now at least generally agreed that the choice lies between Shakespeare and Massinger. Beaumont has indeed been suggested as a possible candidate, but no evidence of any weight has been submitted on his behalf, certainly none to be compared in cogency with that presented by Mr Boyle on behalf of Massinger[1].

As to the extent of Fletcher's share in this play there is practically no difference of opinion. His metre is so distinctive that the identification of his work has hitherto been allowed, and may safely be allowed, to rest upon the metrical evidence alone. The portion from which Fletcher's metrical peculiarities are absent consists of the whole of Act I, Act III, Scene i, and Act V, Scenes i and iii. It is this part of the play, with the addition of the prose scenes, II, i, III, ii, and IV, iii, that has been thought to contain Shakespeare's contribution to the drama, and which Mr Boyle claims for Massinger.

[1] It is to be observed that the inclusion of the play in the second Beaumont and Fletcher folio is of no more value as evidence for Beaumont than for Massinger, as it has been established beyond doubt that Massinger and not Beaumont was Fletcher's partner in a large number of the so-called Beaumont and Fletcher plays.

The believers in Shakespeare's authorship rely chiefly upon the undoubtedly strong similarity of the verse to that of Shakespeare's later works, and upon the beauty of particular passages, conceived to be beyond the power either of Massinger or of any dramatist but Shakespeare, while their opponents have found their strongest arguments in the total lack of power in the development of character exhibited by the play and the large number of its allusions to passages in Shakespeare's acknowledged works.

The general grounds upon which Mr Boyle based his advocacy of Massinger's authorship may be briefly stated as follows:

i. There is no other dramatic author of the period whose style shows so close a metrical correspondence with that of the non-Fletcher part of the play.

ii. The reminiscences of Shakespeare are characteristic of Massinger who has 'continual touches showing that some passage of Shakespeare was running in his head.'

iii. The sensual language of the principal female characters, the 1st Queen, Hippolita and Emilia, could not conceivably have been put by Shakespeare into the mouths of virtuous women, but is typical of Massinger's heroines.

The evidence presented by Mr Boyle in support of these propositions has admittedly raised a strong presumptive case for Massinger's authorship. It is however obvious that this evidence cannot be accepted as conclusive, unless it can also be shown that in its connexions with the authentic work of Massinger the language of the play itself shows decisive traces of his hand. Evidence of this kind is particularly important in the case of Massinger, because he is notorious for his self-repetitions. It is true that these repetitions are most conspicuous and abundant in his later work from 1620 onwards, whereas it is generally agreed that this play is of a comparatively early date. But even so one would expect that an examination of its text would reveal some unmistakable trace of Massinger's language, the presence of a few at least of the characteristic sentiments or images to be found in his later plays. Unfortunately, Mr Boyle's evidence is here unsatisfactory and for this reason his views have failed to obtain general assent. With one or two exceptions the passages he has cited carry only slight weight, and there is none in which the resemblance of sentiment and phraseology combined is such as to inspire the confident conviction that Massinger and none other was Fletcher's partner in this play. Is

it possible to complete the evidence in this respect? I think I shall be able to show that it is, that the connexions between these disputed scenes of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and the acknowledged work of Massinger are not only more numerous than has hitherto been suspected, but that they are of such a kind as to establish his authorship beyond doubt, and thus once for all to determine the problem that Professor Spalding, originally a defender of Shakespeare's authorship, eventually declared to be insoluble.

Amongst the parallels from Massinger's works cited below it will be seen that I have included passages from certain plays originally published amongst the works of Beaumont and Fletcher, but since proved to have been written by Massinger and Fletcher. That Massinger's authorship of the scenes from which these passages are quoted has been conclusively established, admits of no question. The division of these Massinger and Fletcher plays between the two authors rests upon the investigations of Messrs Fleay and Boyle and the accuracy of their results is sufficiently attested by the circumstance that these results have been accepted by all subsequent critics of authority. Parallels from these scenes, although not essential for the purposes of proof, are accordingly here added in order that the evidence may be presented in as complete a form as possible. For the same reason I have also included a few of the passages already noted by Mr Boyle, of which the significance appears to me to be unquestionable[1].

[1] A slight digression on the subject of the differentiation of Fletcher's and Massinger's shares in the plays just referred to may here perhaps be permitted, because it has a bearing upon the present play, though not upon that portion of which the authorship is in question. As in the case of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, the determination of Fletcher's share in these plays rests entirely upon metrical evidence, while in the case of Massinger's contributions the metrical evidence is corroborated by the presence of characteristic repetitions of phrase and sentiment. Amongst the scenes of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* attributed to Fletcher is Act II, Scene v. Amongst the plays in which it is now generally admitted that Fletcher collaborated with Massinger is *A Very Woman, or The Prince of Tarent*, licensed in 1634 and printed in 1655 as by Massinger alone, and of this Act IV, Scene iii is one of the scenes assigned to Fletcher. In each case the attribution rests entirely upon metrical evidence. The trustworthiness of this evidence is strikingly confirmed by a remarkable correspondence in portions of the dialogue of these two scenes, a correspondence which seems hitherto to have escaped attention. I quote first from the dialogue between Theseus, Arcite, Hippolita and Emilia at the beginning of Act II, Scene v of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*:

Theseus. What country bred you?
Arcite. This; but far off, Prince.
Theseus. Are you a Gentleman?
Arcite. My father said so; . . .
. . . . . .
Theseus. You are perfect.
Pirithous. How do you like him, Lady?
Hippolita. I admire him;
I have not seen so young a man so noble
(If he say true) of his sort.

I come now to the evidence of Massinger's hand in the scenes of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* of which the authorship is in question, as revealed by their connexions in language and sentiments with Massinger's work, both in his independent dramas and in those written by him in collaboration with Fletcher[1].

Act I, Scene i. The 3rd Queen kneels to Emilia, begging her to intercede with Theseus on behalf of her sisters in misfortune and herself:

Emilia. Pray stand up,
Your grief is written in your cheek.
3rd Queen. Oh woe,
You cannot read it there. . . . . .
. . . . . .
He that will all the treasure know o' th' earth
Must know the Centre too.

Compare:

And I should gild my misery with false comforts,
If I compared it with an Indian slave's,
That, *with incessant labour to search out*
Some unknown mine, dives almost to the Centre.
The Parliament of Love III, ii.

In this same speech of the 3rd Queen's we have (two concluding lines):

Extremity that sharpens sundry wits
Makes me a fool.

Precisely the same sentiment, though differently phrased, appears again in one of Massinger's scenes of *The Honest Man's Fortune* (III, i):

. . . † cunning calamity
That others gross wits uses to refine,
When I most need it dulls the edge of mine.

Emilia. Believe,
His mother was a wondrous handsome woman,
His face methinks goes that way.
Hippolita. But his body
And fiery mind illustrate a brave father.

Compare with this the dialogue between Almira and Antonio in *A Very Woman*, IV, iii:

Almira. A brave clear mind he has, and nobly season'd.
What country are you of?
Antonio. A Biscan, lady.
Almira. No doubt a Gentleman?
Antonio. My father thought so.
Almira. Ay, and I warrant thee, a right fair woman
Thy mother was. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Of all that e'er I saw thou art the perfectest.

A comparison of these two passages should inspire additional confidence—if it were needed—in the accuracy of the identification of Fletcher's work in both plays.

[1] The passages marked with an obelus have already been noted by Mr Boyle.

All three Queens join in supplication to Theseus to revenge their dead husbands by making immediate war upon the tyrant Creon. The 1st Queen endeavours to work upon him with flattering speeches:

> . . . what you do quickly
> Is not done rashly; your first thought is more
> Than others' laboured meditance.

Compare with this what Francisco says of his flatterers in *The Duke of Milan* IV, i:

> They . . . . . without a blush
> Would swear that I, by nature, had more knowledge
> Than others could acquire by any labour.

Theseus still hesitates, endeavouring to evade the importunity of his petitioners by promising to 'give their dead lords graves'—'the which to do Must make some work with Creon.' The 1st Queen refuses to be satisfied with this assurance. She desires immediate action, and rejoins:

> And that work presents itself to th' doing;
> Now 'twill take form, *the heats are gone tomorrow.*

Not only is this passage significant in that the expression 'the heats' ('the heats of youth' etc.) is frequently met with in Massinger, but the sentiment itself recurs in *The Emperor of the East* II, i:

> † That resolution which grows cold today
> Will freeze tomorrow.

Though he gives directions for the levying of the necessary forces for the war, Theseus is nevertheless determined that the celebration of his marriage with Hippolita shall proceed:

> Artesius, that best knowest
> How to draw out, fit to this enterprise,
> The prim'st for this proceeding, and the number
> To carry such a business, forth and levy
> Our worthiest instruments, whilst we dispatch
> This grand act of our life, this daring deed
> Of fate in wedlock.

'Levy our worthiest instruments' is again characteristic of Massinger. Compare:

> Such as are
> Selected instruments for deep designs.
> *Believe as You List* v, i.

> Heaven is most gracious to you
> In choosing you to be the instrument
> Of such a pious work.
> *Emperor of the East* III, ii.

And with the phrase 'dispatch this grand act of our life' applied by Theseus to his marriage with Hippolita, Mr Boyle compares:

> † And rest assured that, this great work dispatched,
> *The Maid of Honour* v, ii.

where the 'great work' is the marriage of Aurelia and Bertoldo.

Immediately after the speech of Theseus just quoted, the 1st Queen, despairing of success, turns to her two fellow-petitioners, exclaiming:

> Let us be *widows to our woes*, delay
> Commends us to a famishing hope.

They have, as the 2nd Queen observes, 'come unseasonably,' it is no time for them to be wedded to their woes when the thoughts of Theseus are centred on his own happiness. Compare the similar metaphor in Massinger's part of *Thierry and Theodoret* IV, ii:

> How dare you then omit the ceremony
> Due to the funeral of all my hopes,
> Or come unto the *marriage of my sorrows*,
> But in such colours as may sort with them?

At length Hippolita herself is won over and urges Theseus to consent to the postponement of their nuptials. Though sorry, she says, 'that she should be such a suitor,'

> . . . . . yet I think
> Did I not by *th' abstaining of my joy*
> *Which breeds a deeper longing*, cure their surfeit
> That craves a present med'cine, I should pluck
> All ladies' scandal on me.

Mr Boyle has drawn attention to this speech as being typical—which it undoubtedly is—of the kind of language used in Massinger's plays by women presumably intended as paragons of virtue. But apart from this, the sentiment appears again, in much the same form, in *The Unnatural Combat* III, iv. The elder Malefort is here speaking of the postponement of the marriage of his daughter Theocrine:

> . . . . though I shall think
> Short minutes years, till it be perfected,
> I will defer that which I most desire;
> And so must she, till *longing expectation*,
> *That heightens pleasure*, makes her truly know
> Her happiness.

And with 'cure their surfeit that craves a present med'cine' compare:

> since the wound requires a sudden cure

—where the expression is again figurative—in *The Emperor of the East* III, ii. Compare also *The Bashful Lover* IV, ii (end of scene):

> I'll dissolve this riddle
> At better leisure; the wound given to my daughter
> Which, in your honour, you are bound to cure,
> Exacts our present care.

Emilia too joins the chorus of petitioners and at last Theseus yields, with the protestation:

> I am entreating of myself to do
> That which you kneel to have me.

This deserves special notice, because the idea of a person begging as a favour for 'that which' the giver is anxious to bestow, or again of a person being compelled to kneel or beg for what should be freely offered, is one continually recurring in Massinger, e.g.

> You entreat of me, sir,
> What I should offer to you.
> *The Unnatural Combat* I, i.
>
> You demand
> That which with all the service of my life
> I should have labour'd to obtain for you.
> *Ibid.* II, iii.
>
> I should not need to plead for that which you
> With joy should offer.
> *The Bondman* V, iii.
>
> Must we entreat . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> For that which thou ambitiously should'st kneel for?
> *The Roman Actor* IV, ii.

Act I, Scene ii. This scene, devoted to a conversation between Palamon and Arcite on the corrupt state of Thebes and the tyrannies of its ruler Creon, has a counterpart in *The Roman Actor* (end of Act I, Sc. i) where there is a like discussion between Ælius Lamia, Junius Rusticus, and Palphurius Sura of the abuses prevalent at Rome and the tyrannies of Domitian. The general resemblance of these two scenes is of itself striking[1]. But a close comparison reveals something more than a general resemblance. It is in these words that Arcite speaks of the state of affairs at Thebes under Creon:

> I spake of Thebes,
> How dangerous if we will keep our honours
> It is for our residing, where every evil
> Hath a good colour; where ev'ry seeming good 's
> A certain evil.

Much in the same way does Junius Rusticus describe Rome under Domitian:

> So dangerous the age is, and such bad acts
> Are practised everywhere, we hardly sleep,
> Nay, cannot dream with safety. All our actions
> Are called in question; to be nobly born
> Is now a crime . . . . . .
> . . . . . To be virtuous
> Is to be guilty.

[1] For yet another scene of the same kind, see the opening scene (Massinger's) of *The Double Marriage*, where Virolet and Juliana discuss the oppressive government of Naples by the 'Arragonian tyrant,' Ferrand.

Arcite is for leaving Thebes and its temptations; 'Let us leave the city,' he says:

> . . . . . for not to swim
> I' th' aid o' th' current, were almost to sink,
> At least to frustrate striving, and to follow
> The common stream, 'twould bring us to an eddy
> Where we should turn or drown:

while in *The Roman Actor* Palphurius Sura, deciding that it is hopeless to resist the Senate in its corrupt subservience to Domitian, observes:

> . . . for my part
> I will obey the time; it is in vain
> To strive against the torrent.

With this last speech of Arcite's compare also *The Duke of Milan* v, i:

> Such indeed, I grant,
> The stream of his affection was, and ran
> A constant course, till I, with cunning malice
> . . . . . .
> Made it turn backward,

and *Believe as You List* v, i:

> We, with ease,
> Swim down the stream, but to oppose the torrent
> Is dangerous, and to go more or less
> Than we are warranted, fatal.

In one of Valerius's speeches towards the close of this scene, we have

> Theseus . . . is at hand to seal
> The promise of his wrath.

'Seal' is a word for which Massinger shows a marked partiality. He uses it again much in the same way in *The Virgin-Martyr* v, ii:

> . . . bold Theophilus . . . in my presence sealed
> His holy anger on his daughters' hearts.

Act i, Sc. iii. In the second speech of Pirithous (almost at the beginning of the scene) we have:

> Though I know
> His ocean needs not my poor drops.

Compare:

> Though I know
> The ocean of your apprehensions needs not
> The rivulet of my poor cautions.
> *Believe as You List* v, i.

This parallel alone should be conclusive of Massinger's authorship. There is no possibility of explaining a resemblance of such a kind as this by the supposition that Massinger imitated Shakespeare. Though he has many echoes and reminiscences of Shakespearean

passages, he does not slavishly reproduce their very words and manner of phrasing. We have here an instance of the self-repetitions typical of Massinger.

At the end of the scene, Hippolita, in reply to Emilia's confident assertion that she will never 'love any that's called man,' observes:

> I must no more believe thee, in this point,
> Than I will trust a sickly appetite,
> That loathes even as it longs.

Compare:

> † No more of love, good father,
> It was my surfeit, and I loathe it now
> As men in fevers meat they fell sick on:
> *A Very Woman* (Massinger and Fletcher) IV, ii.

—a passage already noted by Mr Boyle; to which may be added:

> Pleasing viands
> Are made sharp by sick palates.
> *The Guardian* III, i.

Act I, Sc. iv. The next passage to be noted is in Theseus's speech applauding the prowess of Palamon and Arcite:

> By th' helm of Mars, I saw them in the war,
> *Like to a pair of lions smear'd with prey,*
> Make lanes in troops aghast.

'Like to a pair of lions smear'd with prey' is doubtless a fine, sounding simile. But is it therefore too fine for Massinger? We can scarcely expect to find it repeated elsewhere. But he has a simile of much the same kind, and almost exactly the same metrical value, in *The Bashful Lover* III, ii:

> Out of the troops that scour'd the plain, I saw
> Two gallant horsemen break forth . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> *Like falcons on the stretch to seize the prey.*

For the expression 'make lanes in troops aghast' (though the figure is not peculiar to Massinger) we may compare:

> follow
> The lane this sword makes for you.
> *The False One* (M. & F.) V, iii.

> How he bestirr'd him! what a lane he made!
> And through their fiery bullets thrust securely.
> *The Lovers Progress* (M. & F.) I, ii.

In Act II, Sc. i (a prose scene) we have an indication of Massinger's hand in the use of the word 'deliver' in the sense of 'describe, represent';

> (Jailor) I am given out to be better lin'd than it can appear to me report is a true speaker: I would I were really that I am *deliver'd* to be.

Compare:

> I cannot
> Deliver him as he deserves.
> *Great Duke of Florence* I, i.

> She is deliver'd . . . to us by Contarino,
> For a masterpiece in nature.
> *Ibid.* I, ii.

> Men of qualities,
> As I have deliver'd you to the protectress.
> *The Emperor of the East* I, ii.

This sense is not found in Shakespeare.

The next Massinger scene is III, i. Here (in Arcite's first speech) we find

> [thou] hast likewise blest a place
> With thy sole presence.

A sentiment which, as Mr Boyle has noted, is conspicuously frequent in Massinger. Compare:

> † what place
> Does he now bless with his presence?
> *Great Duke of Florence* I, i.

> . . . every minute we expect
> To be bless'd with his presence.
> *The Bondman* I, iii.

> This room will instantly be sanctified
> With her blest presence.
> *Emperor of the East* I, ii.

Act IV, Sc. iii. This is the prose scene containing the crazy utterances of the Jailor's daughter and the doctor's advice to her father and wooer as to the method of treatment to be adopted to restore her to sanity. We find here the same conception of mental distraction as elsewhere in Massinger[1].

Almira and Martino Cardenes in *A Very Woman* and Antoninus in *The Virgin-Martyr* have all, like the Jailor's daughter, been driven demented by the violence of their love. They exhibit the same symptoms of distraction, in each case described by the doctor in attendance. Of the Jailor's daughter we are told that it is 'not an engraffed madness' but 'a thick and profound melancholy' from which she suffers, while in the case of Cardenes it is 'melancholy at the height, too near akin to madness' and in that of Antoninus 'deep melancholy.' The Jailor's daughter 'sleeps little' and 'what broken piece of matter so e'er she's about, the name Palamon lards it.' Almira

[1] This has also been pointed out by Mr Boyle, to whose remarks on the subject my own are supplementary.

too, scarcely sleeps at all, and continually calls out 'Where is Martino?' while Antoninus has 'broken slumbers' and 'cries out on Dorothea.' Almira, like the Jailor's daughter, as Mr Boyle notes, 'pours forth scraps and shreds of classical mythology.' Both have what Almira describes as 'strange waking dreams of hell,' and babble of Proserpine and the tortures of the damned. There are also the same notions of the correct treatment for mental derangement. 'Green songs of love' are to be sung to the Jailor's daughter, while for Antoninus 'music' is prescribed. The doctor of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* says that his patient is in a falsehood 'which is with falsehoods to be combated.' This is exactly the method which Paulo, the physician of *A Very Woman*, successfully puts into practice in his cure of Cardenes, appearing before him in various disguises and thus 'inventing the objects' of his patient's diseased imagination.

We come now to Act v, Sc. i. In Palamon's invocation to Venus the following passage occurs:

> I *have never been foul-mouth'd against thy law*
> Ne'er revealed secret . . . . . .
> . . . . . I *never practis'd*
> Upon man's wife, nor would the libels read
> Of liberal wits: I *never at great feasts*
> *Sought to betray a beauty.*

Compare *The Bondman* II, i. (Leosthenes to Cleora):

> I *ne'er tuned*
> *Loose notes to your chaste ears*, or brought rich presents
> For my artillery, to batter down
> The fortress of your honour; † *nor endeavour'd*
> *To make your blood run high at solemn feasts*,
> With viands that provoke . . . . . .
> . . . . . *never practis'd*
> The cunning and corrupting arts they study,
> That wander in the wild maze of desire.

In addition to the resemblances here, it is to be noted that 'foul-mouth'd' is a pet adjective of Massinger's, and that foremost amongst the 'rules of honour' enumerated by Paulo in *A Very Woman* IV, ii is 'ne'er to reveal the secrets of a friend.'

After the invocation of Palamon comes the invocation of Emilia:

> O, sacred, shadowy, cold and constant Queen
> . . . . . who to thy female knights
> Allow'st no more blood than will make a blush.

Compare:

> (Jacintha to Don Henrique) . . . if impious Acts
> Have left thee blood enough to make a blush.
> *The Spanish Curate* (M. & F.) III, iii.

I will dye
Your cheeks with blushes, if in your sear'd veins
There yet remains so much of honest blood
To make the colour.
The Little French Lawyer (M. & F.) I, i.

Thy intent
To be a whore, leaves thee not blood enough
To make an honest blush.
The Duke of Milan IV, iii.

...the too much praise
This lord, my guardian once, has shower'd upon me,
Could not but spring up blushes in my cheeks,
If grief had left me blood enough to speak
My humble modesty.
The Parliament of Love V, i.

Later on in the same speech, Emilia observes:

He of the two pretenders, that best loves me
And has the truest title in't, let him
Take off my wheaten garland.

The reference here is to the wheaten wreath which it was customary for a bride to wear at her wedding, and for the bridegroom to remove. Compare:

† He that can
With love and service best deserve the garland,
With your consent let him wear it.
The Bashful Lover IV, iii.

With Act V, Sc. iii we come to the end of Massinger's part of the play. Emilia, comparing her two lovers, says of Palamon that he 'has a most menacing aspect':

his brow
Is grav'd, and seems *to bury what it frowns on.*

There is here a peculiar, not to say far-fetched, idea, which we find again in *The Duke of Milan* IV, iii:

Shall, I say, these virtues,
So many and so various trials of
Your constant mind, *be buried in the frown*
(To please you, I will say so) of a fair woman?

Lastly, on hearing that Arcite is the victor in the combat, Emilia exclaims:

Half-sights saw
That Arcite was no babe; God's lid, his richness
And costliness of spirit look'd through him.

'Half-sights' is a curious expression. I do not remember seeing it elsewhere. But Massinger has something very like it in *The Bashful*

Lover I, i, where Matilda's waiting-woman gives vent to her appreciation of Hortensio's comely appearance, with the exclamation :

> Observe his posture
> But with a *quarter-look* !

In this comparison of the language of the non-Fletcherian scenes of this play with that of Massinger's authentic works, I have purposely omitted many correspondences of phrase and sentiment of a less definite kind. It is obviously upon the quality rather than the quantity of such parallelisms that their evidential value depends. To say, as Mr Boyle does, that *The Two Noble Kinsmen* 'bears Massinger's stamp as plainly as *The Duke of Milan* or *The Unnatural Combat*[1],' is to exaggerate. Had this been the case its authorship would not so long have baffled enquiry. It must be admitted that the language of the play occasionally rises to a poetic height rarely achieved by Massinger elsewhere, and that it sometimes exhibits a peculiarly 'Shakespearean' directness and brevity of expression. That Massinger was 'steeped in Shakespeare' all his dramatic work bears witness, and if we admit his collaboration in this play, at the very outset of his literary career, before his style was definitely formed and when the influence of the foremost dramatist of the age was strongest upon him, the apparently 'Shakespearean' quality of its verse can readily be explained.

Such a body of evidence as is here presented, based as it is upon a detailed examination of the language of the play, cannot be rebutted by arguments in favour of Shakespeare's authorship based upon mere aesthetic impression. If my judgment is not at fault, it must finally exclude *The Two Noble Kinsmen* from the list of 'doubtful plays' and establish its title to a place amongst the works of Massinger and Fletcher.

H. Dugdale Sykes.

Enfield, Middlesex.

[1] *Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger*, New Shakspere Society's *Transactions*, 1880–6, p. 579.

THE SOURCE OF SOUTHERNE'S 'THE FATAL MARRIAGE.'

In the Epistle Dedicatory to Antony Hammond, Esq., of Somersham-Place, prefacing that pathetic tragedy *The Fatal Marriage; or The Innocent Adultery*[1] (4to, 1694), Southerne writes 'I took the Hint of the Tragical part of this Play from a Novel of Mrs *Behn's* call'd *The Fair Vow-Breaker*; you will forgive me for calling it a Hint, when you find I have little more than borrow'd the Question how far such a Distress was to be carry'd upon the Misfortune of a Woman's having innocently two Husbands at the same time.'

It has up till now been confidently and repeatedly asserted that *The Fair Vow-Breaker* (or to give the novel its full title, *The Nun; or, The Fair Vow-Breaker*) is the name under which Mrs Behn's *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty*, a story to be found in all the collected editions of her Histories and Novels, first appeared in a separate *editio princeps*, 12mo, 1689. This is definitely stated by Miss Charlotte E. Morgan in her monograph *The Rise of the Novel of Manners* (The Columbia University Press, 1911), who when speaking of *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty*, appends a footnote: '*History of the Nun, or, The Faire Vow Breaker*, was the title of the first edition, 1689' (p. 83); and again on page 201 under the date 1689 she catalogues: '*The History of the Nun; or the Fair Vow Breaker.* By Aphra Behn. Reprinted in her collected works as *The Perjur'd Beauty.*' Mr A. T. Bartholomew in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. VIII (1912), Chapter VII, The Restoration Drama, III, Tragic Poets, writing of Southerne has as follows: 'It was not until 1694 that, in *The Fatal Marriage; or, The Innocent Adultery*, he achieved a play worthy of his talent. This popular drama was founded on Mrs Aphra Behn's novel *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty.*'

[1] This has nothing to do with Scarron's novel *L'Innocent Adultère* which translated was so popular in the 17th and 18th centuries. Bellmour carried it in his pocket when he went a-courting Laetitia and horrified old Fondlewife who found it (*The Old Batchelor*, 1693). Lydia Languish was partial to its perusal in 1775. Sir A. W. Ward mistakenly assumes that it was Southerne's tragedy she borrowed from the Bath circulating library.

Before Miss Morgan and Mr Bartholomew, such recognized scholars as Sir A. W. Ward, first in his *History of Dramatic Literature*, vol. III, p. 421 (1899), secondly in his able article on Southerne in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; and Joseph Knight in his *David Garrick* (1894) had lent the sanction of their undisputed authority to the above, which has so long been recognized and amply accepted. The fact is that *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty* had not been thoroughly examined in connection with *The Fatal Marriage*. When this was done a serious discrepancy was soon seen to exist. The plot of the novel has literally nothing in common with Southerne's tragedy. It deals indeed with the intrigues of a certain Ardelia, a mere coquette, who by her wicked trifling with three different men is responsible for the severing of friendships and no less than five deaths; her lovers', Elvira's and her own. Isabella, Southerne's heroine, on the other hand, falls a sad victim to the dastardly machinations of Carlos, her black-hearted brother-in-law. She is virtuous and a mirror of constancy: Ardelia is a jade capable of the most callous treachery. Both novel and play end tragically, it is true, but from different motives and in a totally dissimilar manner. The title indeed, *The Nun*, is really a misnomer unless we are by that to understand Elvira, a secondary character in the tale, which can hardly be. Ardelia never takes the veil. Having befooled Don Antonio and embroiled him with Henrique, she retires to a cloister but merely as a parlour boarder, and she meets her fate in the convent garden when on the point of eloping with Sebastian. Southerne's Isabella is a professed nun who has violated her vows and abandoned enclosure[1] for love of Biron; a very different state of affairs.

The crux then is what exactly did Southerne mean by the 'Hint' he borrowed from 'a Novel of Mrs Behn's'? This was investigated in detail by Dr Paul Hamelius of Liège whose *The Source of Southerne's Fatal Marriage* appeared in the *Modern Language Review*, vol. IV, p. 352 (1909). Hamelius quotes from the memoir[2] in volume I of Southerne's works (3 vols.), 1774, 'Printed for T. Evans, near York-buildings; and T. Becket, corner of the Adelphi, Strand.' The passage

[1] From the publication (1678) of L'Estrange's version of Marianne Alcoforado's letters to Noel, Marquis de Chamily and St Leger, *Letters of a Portuguese Nun*, a book often reprinted and one the continued influence of which it is difficult to overestimate, the amours of nuns, monastery intrigues, and the like in a thousand variants were immensely popular. In 1694 we have *Five Love-Letters written by a Cavalier...in answer to the five love-letters written by a Nun*; in 1684 *The Amorous A.: or Love in a Nunnery. A novel*: in 1696 Mrs Manley's *Letters, to which is added a letter from a supposed nun in Portugal to a gentleman in France*: in 1700 *The English Nun; a comical description of a Nunnery*. Cf. Dryden's *The Assignation, or Love in a Nunnery*, produced 1672, 4to, 1673.

[2] Written by T. E. who is undoubtedly Evans.

runs: 'the plot [of *The Fatal Marriage*] by the author's confession is taken from a novel of Mrs Behn's called *The Nun; or, The Fair Vow-Breaker.*' On this he comments: 'the "hint" of Southerne's own statement was transformed into a confession of borrowing.' A little before he also writes: 'Among her [Mrs Behn's] collected novels[1] there is one entitled *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty*, and Mr Gosse has kindly informed me that story is identical with *The Nun; or, The Fair Vow-Breaker* which appears in the *editio princeps* of 1689 (inaccessible to me).' The critic however is able to discover no analogy betwixt novel and tragedy, nor can the question be adequately solved. He finds that the main business of *The Fatal Marriage* is similar to the theme of *The Virgin Captive*, the fifth story in Roger L'Estrange's *The Spanish Decameron*, published in 1687[2]. Howbeit he draws greater attention to the legend of the lovers of Teruel as dramatized in 1638 by Juan Perez de Montalvan, *Los Amantes de Teruel*[3], and declares that the likeness between English and Spanish play is quite unmistakeable, and that accordingly Southerne must have been acquainted with Spanish. Nevertheless at the end of his article Hamelius confesses 'the question is naturally still open whether Southerne was not drawing from some more immediate source — possibly even from some lost version of the story by Mrs Behn herself,' and then again surmises that 'In the Dedication Southerne may have merely intended to pay a compliment to his literary friend Mrs Behn.' Aphra[4] Behn had died April 16, 1689, and this last hypothesis is on the face of it extremely improbable.

During the course of my editing Aphra Behn's complete works it naturally became necessary to examine very closely first editions of both plays and novels, not only for the purpose of careful collation but also to transcribe thence the various Prefaces and Epistles Dedicatory (all of great value) which had never been reprinted. Mr Gosse most generously adding yet another to the many great kindnesses he has shown me, lent me his little duodecimo volume *The History of the Nun; or, The Fair Vow-Breaker*, Licensed Octob. 22, 1688, Ric. Pocock—Printed

[1] Hamelius uses *All the Histories and Novels* (1705) as being the earliest copy in the British Museum. The first edition of *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty* has a separate title page, 1697, and appears bound up in the third edition of *All the Histories and Novels*, general title page 1698.

[2] Advertised in May that year by S. Neale.

[3] There was a comedia on the same subject by A. Reyde Artieda, 1581; and yet another the work of Tirso de Molina, 1635, who bases on Artieda.

[4] This is now the accepted form of the name. There are, of course, many variants. See my edition of Mrs Behn, vol. I, Memoir, p. xvi.

for *A. Baskervile,* at the *Bible,* the Corner of *Essex-Street,* against St *Clement's* Church, 1689.

It may be noticed that the British Museum is extraordinarily poor in Behn items. Of the novels it only possesses one separate first edition, *The Lucky Mistake,* 1689: it even wants a copy of the 1683 quarto *The Young King; or, The Mistake,* a deplorable lacuna. It is of course a matter of common knowledge that the whole Behn bibliography is confused and difficult to an almost unexampled degree.

The History of the Nun; or, The Fair Vow-Breaker[1] was borrowed from Mr Gosse's library primarily in order to transcribe the interesting dedication 'To The Most Illustrious Princess, The Duchess of Mazarine,' but on proceeding to examine the little volume I at once found that here we have an entirely different novel from *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty,* and one moreover which has never been collected from the excessively rare original[2]. A second edition appeared in 1698, 'London. Printed for Tho. Chapman, at the *Angel* in the *Pall-Mall.*' An exemplar exists in the Dyce library, but it is of equal scarcity as the first, if indeed this be not a unique item.

This then is the veritable solution of the whole difficulty and the critics have been most egregiously mistaken. Hamelius' ingenious article is hereby proved to be futile and nugatory.

The story of *The Fair Vow-Breaker* runs as follows: A certain Count Henrick de Vallary (or Valerie) of Iper (Ypres) is so distracted at the death of his wife whom he dearly loves that he joins the Society of Jesus and hands over his infant daughter, Isabella, to the care of her aunt, the abbess of an Augustinian convent. Isabella, as she grows up, resolves to take the veil and in spite of her aunt's wise cautions and her father's warnings persists in this decision. Her wit and beauty are so remarkable that she is already beloved of many gallants, but by none more dearly than Villenoys, who consumed with passion lingers long at Ypres whilst on his way to the siege of Candia. Once however she has pronounced her vows Villenoys betakes himself to the war, and we learn that he is fighting at Candia against the Moslem hordes. Meanwhile Isabella has fallen in love with the brother of a fellow nun, the son of a wealthy noble named Vanhenault. After some languishing and intriguing she escapes from the cloister and the amorous couple fly together to a town forty miles and more away in German territory,

[1] Miss Charlotte E. Morgan (p. 83) wrongly writes *the Faire Vow-Breaker.*

[2] The book once belonged to Charles Kirkpatrick S[harpe], and has the following note in his hand: 'The tragedy of "the Fatal Marriage" was suggested by this Novel, not printed in the collection of Madam Aphra's works.'

where changing their names to Beroone, they are forthwith married and drive 'a Farming Trade.' The Margrave Vanhenault promptly disinherits his son, and ill luck dogs their footsteps, but after two years 'by the Solicitations of the Lady Abbess and the Bishop, who was her near kinsman, they got a Pardon for Isabella's quitting the Monastery and marrying, so that she might now return to her own Country again.' Henault's (Beroone's) father however refuses to forgive him unless he will join the French army against the Turks then at Candia, which eventually the unhappy husband is forced to do. Here he meets with Villenoys whom he has known of old. They exchange confidences. In a skirmish Villenoys sees his friend fall and communicates the news to Isabella. When Candia is taken Villenoys returns home and proceeds to woo the widow who is sincerely lamenting the loss of her beloved husband for whose sake she sacrificed so much. After three years he wins her hand, and being a man of the highest position and great affluence they pass five years of tranquil happiness and content. Isabella none the less leads as retired a life as is convenient with her state, and on one occasion when her husband is away for a week hunting she is supping very privately in her own chamber attended but by a maid, Maria. There is a knock at the gate, and Maria answering the summons finds an ill-favoured fellow in an odd habit who delivers her a ring to hand to her mistress. At the sight of the jewel Isabella almost swoons with fear as it is none other than a pledge she had long ago given Henault, who is indeed the mysterious visitor. She greets him, they sup together, and she has a bed made up for him in an adjoining room. Retiring thither he falls asleep. Isabella, whose love for Henault is dead, overcome with shame and agony at the thought of losing wealth, husband, happiness, in a frenzy smothers her visitor ere he can wake, but at that moment Villenoys, whose friend has been taken ill, returns, and instantly notices her horror and confusion. She tells him that Henault has come back, but that when she revealed her second marriage he expired instantly of a broken heart. To save her honour Villenoys places the body in a sack purposing to throw it into the river. But Isabella, fearing that he will reproach her and even perchance reveal her horrid secret, as she is helping to hoist the burden on to his back, desperately sews the sack to his coat with several strong stitches so that when Villenoys with a sudden jerk swings the corpse over the rail of the bridge he himself is dragged down into the water and drowned. The crime is discovered, but Isabella evades all suspicion until the arrival of a French gentleman, who had been a fellow slave

with Henault in Turkey, and who having escaped seeks his friend. Questions are asked, and Isabella, brought to justice, confesses all. She is executed, and on the scaffold makes a speech warning all Vow-Breakers.

It is worth while giving a synopsis of so rare a book, and thence it may be clearly seen that the points of resemblance between the novel and tragedy are many and very close. We have the heroine's name Isabella; in the play Biron her first husband has been disinherited by his father Count Baldwin upon his marrying Isabella, who broke out of her convent for his sake, and he has been forced 'to go to the Siege of Candy, where he was kill'd.' Both in novel and play Isabella has obtained the Church's forgiveness for her violated vows. Southerne has Villeroy as the name of Isabella's second husband; Mrs Behn Villenoys. Biron and Beroone are of course the same word. Both in novel and play the slavery lasts seven years: the incident of the return and the ring are exactly similar: in Act v, Sc. 2 Isabella frantic is about to stab Biron as he sleeps on a couch, but when he rises she shrieks and throws her poniard away; Mrs Behn makes her go 'to the bed of the unfortunate Henault with a penknife in her hand; but considering, she knew not how to conceal the blood should she cut his throat, she resolves to strangle him.' Southerne's catastrophe is of course entirely different from that of the novel. His heroine is innocent throughout and wins all our sympathies. He has also with true dramatic instinct introduced the sinister figure of Carlos, whose treacheries and villainy bring about all the mischiefs, death and woe. Nevertheless many a touch and minute detail in addition to those particularized above are drawn from *The Fair Vow-Breaker*, and by the identification of this novel as a separate piece not as *editio princeps* of *The Perjur'd Beauty* the whole difficulty has been solved, and the source of *The Fatal Marriage* amply revealed. Both *The Nun; or, The Fair Vow-Breaker* and *The Nun; or, The Perjur'd Beauty* have of course found their rightful place in my recent edition of Mrs Behn (Vol. v, The Novels).

Scenes of the amusing underplot of *The Fatal Marriage* (which contains some capital comedy, played as excellently well by Anne Bracegirdle as were the more serious passages by the 'famous Madam Barry') Southerne directly took from *The Night Walker; or, The Little Thief*, that admirable piece printed as Fletcher's in 1640, having been, according to Herbert's license, 'corrected by Shirley' in 1633. The purgatorial farce may be traced to the *Decamerone*, Gior. III, Novella 8,

whose rubric runs: 'Ferondo, mangiata certa polvere, è sotterrato per morto; e dall' abate, che la moglie di lui si gode, tratto dalla sepoltura, è messo in prigione, e fattogli credere, che egli è in purgatório; e poi risuscitato per suo nutrica un figliuolo dello abate, nella moglie di lui generato.' It is the *Feronde, ou le Purgatoire* of La Fontaine.

It may not be entirely irrelevant to say a word in favour of Southerne's comic talents, which were certainly of a very high order. The underplot of *The Fatal Marriage* and more particularly that of *Oroonoko*, both almost universally decried, and in later years shockingly mutilated in representation, are first-rate comedy. *The Maid's Last Prayer* and *The Wives' Excuse*, which latter won an immortal compliment from Dryden, have much wit and facile diction, whilst *Sir Antony Love; or, The Rambling Lady* is replete with spirit, sparkle, and abandon, and equal to the raciest scenes of Vanbrugh and Farquhar themselves.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

TWICKENHAM.

SCHILLER'S 'ROBBERS' IN ENGLAND.

TOWARDS the end of the eighteenth century, in the seventeen-eighties, to be more exact, a student in Edinburgh became aware of German tragedy, and of Schiller's *Räuber* in particular. He belonged to the Royal Society, and read a paper on this new subject at one of their meetings, a guarded and somewhat tentative paper, intended to interest but not to evangelise. 'I only intend these remarks,' he apologised, 'as presenting a sketch of something that merits the further enquiry of the industrious.' He spoke more as a scientific analyst pronouncing judgement on the ore of a new mine, than as a pioneer who has pressed far into the hills of a strange country and returns with rich accounts of unspoiled glories. In such an unassuming fashion he gave his report; and the young generation cried that he had found Eldorado, and hastened to prepare their ships for the adventure.

For all his undemonstrative demeanour, Henry Mackenzie[1] had caught the thrill, and instinctively seized the very qualities the age most loved and needed. His suggestions pointed out with extraordinary acuteness the lines which German literature in England was to take. The qualities he admired were those the next generation worshipped; the plays he praised were later passed from hand to hand, their names grown commonplace with use. And this in spite of his clinging to the traditions of the past age. He could not help feeling that some apology had to be made for the plays to his own critical mind. He referred to the high-wrought sensibility and refined sentiment which characterised German literature at the time—*Werter* had made it adored by the youth of every country. There lay its explanation and defence; it was the mark of a young literature, inexperienced as yet in the wider issues of life. It was indeed the first quality to appeal in England—as, after all, its development had been fostered by English influences—and this depth and intimacy of sentiment did its part in bringing our literature back, often by devious paths, to a recognition of the dignity and

[1] Author of *The Man of Feeling*. The paper was read to the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1788.

romance of the everyday. Again, Mackenzie felt apprehensive as to the effect of the spirit of revolt in this literature. Rebellion against authority seemed to invite the worst that polite criticism could do. In the tragedies, the scene was 'sullied with murder and disfigured with madness as often as that of ancient English tragedy; the plays went beyond the utmost limit of Shakespeare in change of scene and multiplicity of action.' Still for his own part he was not disposed to blame this recklessness, for it gave opportunity for passages of heightened imagination and 'displeases less than some disciples of Aristotle are apt to suppose.' He suggested that it was worth while sacrificing purity of form to gain a fresher gust of life. Connected with this freedom was the element of sublimity, or rather of a grandiose sentiment verging on sublimity, which proved the strongest attraction of German literature. He could not but feel a sense of shock, but the very boldness and nobility of the conception held him. Trampling the insipid formality which was all the representation of restrained passion and chastened manners could afford, the poet cried aloud that men could still rise to the heights of daring. Mackenzie, like the whole poetic world, thrilled to the summons.

Not uncritical in his judgements, he yet gave a warm appreciation of Schiller's *Räuber*. 'Impressive' was the word that expressed his feeling best. 'The author has drawn, from the sources of an ardent and creative imagination, characters and situations of the most impressive kind and has endowed them with a language in the highest degree eloquent, impassioned and sublime.' There was an element of strangeness about the play which fascinated him, in spite of the fact that he had been troubled by the wildness of Otway. The new combination took his startled enthusiasm unawares. The figure of Karl Moor, endued 'with a soul of fire and a heart of sensibility,' separated from ordinary humanity by tremendous fate, and set against a background of woods and deserts, presented 'a kind of preternatural personage, wrapped in all the grandeur of visionary beings.' He seemed especially moved by the sunset scene by the Danube. The tenderness of feeling here evinced gave depth to the somewhat garish colours of the story and reconciled him to them. The sense of wonder was so deadened with disuse in the eighteenth century, that it needed a rough awakening, like a paralysed nerve, which is only quickened by an electric current. It was almost with a start of surprise that Mackenzie welcomed this product of the solitary imagination, 'one of the most uncommon productions that modern times can boast.'

Mackenzie's restrained wording belied his enthusiasm; nevertheless it achieved his purpose. There were men who heard him quick to receive the message. Lord Woodhouselee was evidently caught, either by firsthand acquaintance with the lecture or the subsequent discussion. Nor was his interest short-lived, for, a year or two later, he published the first translation of the *Räuber* from the original. (Mackenzie had worked from unsatisfactory French versions.) Scott too, of the younger generation, owed his initiation in German literature to Mackenzie and Woodhouselee, and formed a class to further the study.

Shortly afterwards a group of students appeared at Oxford, and from them the enthusiasm was handed on to Coleridge. In 1794 he went up and made the acquaintance of Southey at Balliol. It appears that among the thousand and one subjects on which undergraduates are wont to converse, German found a place. Coleridge's curiosity was roused; and when he returned to Cambridge, he borrowed a translation of the *Räuber*, probably Woodhouselee's, and sat down to read. It was rough November, and he sat up till after midnight, held captive by the extraordinary power of the drama. At last the nervous tension grew too great. He threw down the volume, and, by way of relieving his overwrought emotion, wrote to Southey. ''Tis past one o'clock—I sat down at twelve to read the *Robbers* of Schiller. I have read, chill and trembling, to the place where Moor fires a pistol over the robbers who are asleep. I could read no more. Who is this Schiller, this convulser of the heart? I tremble like an aspen leaf.... Why have we ever called Milton sublime? That Count de Moor—horrible wielder of heart-withering virtues!'... It did not need the late hour and silence to produce this impression of force and grandeur. Every reader felt it, to a greater or less degree, as inevitably as everyone is conscious of the power of the Atlantic rollers pouring in among the Cornish rocks. The largeness of Schiller's conception was no deception of nebulous fancy. He gave mountain scenery to an age just awakening to the mountain glory. Coleridge met the experience with the violence of generous youth. The emotion of the night was not packed off with the morning's dreams, fairy gold discovered to be dead leaves in sober daylight; it held true. Later he probably smiled over the expression he gave it, but even in the extravagance of the sonnet to Schiller, the words reveal what the German poet meant to man after man in England: a shock of wonder almost reverent, and a sudden wild pride at finding answering force within himself.

It is just possible that Schiller's political indignation caught the

ear of the young revolutionaries, exultant over the upheaval in France, and weaving fantastic schemes of communism. They were not alone in this. All the plays first read were the more turbulent ones of the 'Sturm und Drang' period. The reviewers saw the dangerous connection at once. German literature, they fulminated, came to our shores with those tremendous convulsions of the political world 'when the abyss of error was pouring forth all her brood of serpents.' The connection showed itself in quiet places where it might have been least expected. At Norwich a Revolutionary Society was formed in 1790, and one of its members was William Taylor. He was a keen Liberal, a friend of Burke's opponents, and roused himself to write a poem of rejoicing on the fall of the Bastille. He was already familiar with German literature, and had personal knowledge of some of the authors themselves, as, ten years before, he had travelled in Germany and made some lasting friendships. Returning to Norwich, he drew around him a group of friends who helped to spread the enthusiasm. A translation of *Lenore* produced quite a small storm. Taylor's old schoolmistress, Mrs Barbauld, carried it off to Edinburgh, where it was made known to Dugald Stewart and to Scott who made his own famous translation thereafter. Taylor worked on at Norwich for the next thirty years, with a deepening understanding of the permanent value of German work. He wrote articles on Klopstock, Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Wieland. Several papers on *Die Räuber* appeared in a local newspaper. But his youthful translation of *Lenore* did more to further the course of literary taste than his later and finer translations, and won more converts to the study of German than his scholarly essays. He tried to establish an appreciation too refined and catholic to hold an age that wanted only excitement—food for the imagination. The stream of popular feeling rushed by and left him in a quiet backwater.

To the poets of the new school, the early work of Schiller and Goethe was of paramount importance. They were daily growing clearer about the position they must take up, and sifting out what was permanent and true to themselves from the multitude of ideas that beset them. The dramas in which two other young poets had thrown out their new belief challenged a like brave action. In 1795 Wordsworth was settled at Racedown, and one of the first attempts of his poetic career was *The Borderers*. It is clear that the impression of *Die Räuber* was fresh in his mind, whenever or wherever he came upon it: idea after idea bears the mark of Schiller's conception. Doubtless there are more subtle proofs than can now be traced. In the

woven ideas, only the main outlines of the complex pattern show clear; the minute touches, which cost much in heart and brain, are of necessity lost. Wordsworth was still occupied with his experiences of the Revolution. The sombre questioning, to which the betrayal of his hopes in France had led, turned his mind to the tragic idea. He brooded over the terrible truth that sin is apt to start from its opposite qualities. With the spectacle of Paris under the Terror before him, he could only ruminate bitterly that this was the end of high and generous ideals—this came from reverence for reason and trust in logical thought. *Die Räuber* dealt with these very problems. The social problem pervades the tragedy, but it centres in those more universal and individual facts to which Wordsworth had penetrated. The theme is stated in double fashion. In Karl Moor is shown evil springing from high impulse: the brave heart gone astray, lacking the clear vision of the mind; while Franz offers the reverse of the medal, the self-destruction of mind divorced from heart.

The study could not fail to occupy Wordsworth. He made his way into it deeply. The characters of the two 'Lake Poets' come out strongly in the way they met this play. Coleridge felt immediately the passion of it, and the eerie inevitableness of the story. It caught his imagination as a whole; passages here and there haunted him. Wordsworth took it into his solitary contemplations, pondered over the ideas that lay behind it, thought out their bearings on his own troubles, and incorporated the whole conception in his own plan. The plot of the *Borderers* grows in essence in every part from the problem of Karl and Franz Moor; in form, a dozen traits and incidents betray their source.

Marmaduke is driven from his home by personal misunderstanding; and an idealist's desire to set right the infamies of his age drives him to throw in his lot with a band of freebooters, dealing rough justice; whose leader he becomes. Like Karl Moor he is of noble character and aspect. His face bespeaks

> A deep and simple meekness: and that Soul
> Which with the motion of a virtuous act
> Flashes a look of terror upon guilt,
> Is, after conflict, quiet as the ocean,
> By a miraculous finger stilled at once[1].

It is the face of Karl, frank, gentle to tenderness, revealing an unconquerable spirit: 'den feurigen Geist, der ihn für jeden Reiz von

[1] *Borderers*, I, 1. Compare the description of Karl in the first scene of *Die Räuber*.

Grösse und Schönheit so empfindlich macht, diese Offenbarkeit, die seine Seele auf dem Auge spiegelt...diesen männlichen Mut.' His temper is too fine to rest content in outlaw life. A critical moment finds him despondent, convinced that his way of healing the evil time was wrong. The trouble lay deeper than he thought. 'We look But at the surfaces of things, and rush upon a cure That flatters us because it asks not thought: The malady is better hid[1].' So he comes to face his failure, and to acknowledge that instead of defending right he has done flagrant wrong. He forces himself to confession:

> I am the man...
> Presumptuous above all that ever breathed,
> Who, casting as I thought a guilty Person
> Upon Heaven's righteous judgment, did become
> An instrument of Fiends[2].

It is an humble echo of Moor's proud avowal that 'zwei Menschen wie ich den ganzen Bau der sittlichen Welt zu Grunde richten würden.' The force of Moor's tumultuous spirit is not in him; but with what closeness he may, he follows him in tense restraint of passion in renunciation. Acknowledging his guilt, he holds the joy of love to be none of his; he denies his passion for Idonea and yields up the leadership of the band with the same steadfastness with which Moor bids farewell to happiness and life itself.

The agent of Marmaduke's downfall is Oswald, once captain presumptive of the band. He has learned of Spiegelberg what it is to be eaten with jealousy of a younger man who supplanted him; he has learned to lure him through a forlorn attempt at heroism—into the trap. He remembers the very catchwords:

> Today you have thrown off the tyranny
> That lives but in the torpid acquiescence
> Of our emasculated souls, the tyranny
> Of the world's masters, with the musty rules
> By which they uphold their craft from age to age[3].

He plays his tune on the chords of Marmaduke's character, but shares the traitor's fate, falling under the daggers of the faithful outlaws. Oswald's training in the management of others, however, has been thorough. If Spiegelberg practised on Karl, Franz was even more expert with his father; and his intellectual love of the game of intrigue, together with his disappointed materialism and self-assertion, laid the foundations of Oswald's philosophy. The immediate cause of revolt

[1] *Borderers*, II, 3 (abridged).
[2] *Borderers*, V, 3. Compare with *Räuber*, V, 2.
[3] Compare *Die Räuber*, I, 2.

with him was dissimilar; the right of the elder son does not trouble him, but he lights on the same casuistical arguments to defend himself. Once he slew an innocent man under a misunderstanding and to elude remorse persuades himself that it cannot matter:

> Action is transitory—a step, a blow—...
> 'Tis done, and in the after-vacancy
> We wonder at ourselves like men betrayed:
> Suffering is permanent, obscure and dark,
> And shares the nature of infinity[1].

And this dominion of suffering he revolts against as injustice. Why endure this strain, when the self must be free if it is to grow? He flings out a challenge: the world is material; there is no necessity laid upon any man; the brave shall take their own will in the world's despite. But he wears the yoke of suffering nevertheless, and knows that to be the greatest ill he can give his enemy. He snares Marmaduke into the same wrong he has done; tangles his mind with the same fine-seeming argument, and having gained his will, makes shift to scorn his own downfall. The problem of Franz, removed from the social indignation which led to his creation, assumes a more psychological aspect.

The result of the philosophy for both is the same in action and in certain strains of thought. Like many minds rejecting all religious belief, they become the prey of superstition. The remnants of rejected faith spell terror to Franz—Oswald shows a 'sudden blankness' of face at the mention of God, and has built up a strange superstition of his own, which he seems afraid to divulge, answering only vaguely when questioned, 'I hold of spirits—and a sun in heaven.'

It was in the creation of Oswald that most of Wordsworth's thought was expended. The experience of the fearful incidents of the Revolution meant, for his speculative temperament, not merely the test of his faith in the ultimate good of France, but a revision of all his ideas of human nature. It had been bitterly impressed on him that there is 'no cheaper engine than misery to degrade a man, nor any half so sure.' It was this spiritual mystery, which troubled him most deeply, that he embodied in the figure of Oswald. And it was perfectly natural that a play which dealt with this problem, even without the arresting power of its expression, should hold his mind till he scarcely knew whether the thought was his own or from the printed page.

In this way constant similitudes appear, even to details, in the

[1] *Borderers*, III, 5. This idea was evidently strong in Wordsworth's mind when he was writing, and is intimately bound up with the conception of the play. It evidently expressed an idea important to him, as he repeated the lines in another place.

background against which the central figures stand out. Herbert and Idonea, the victim of Oswald's scheming and his daughter, whom Marmaduke loves, move together like pale memories of 'alter Moor' and Amalia. The very name of the girl chimes an echo, as if the poet's mind were playing with the syllables. The same wild moorland scenery serves for both; a ruined castle on the hillside makes a foreground. Even tiny incidents, like the hero's sudden faintness and demand for water, which occur quite naturally in the German, produce their useless echo in the English play.

During the last months Wordsworth spent at Racedown, Coleridge brought over the opening scenes of a tragedy he had in hand, and read them to his friend. Wordsworth listened eagerly. It was fine work, he decided, and the end was not a dreamy project as other ends of Coleridge's poems were to be. The work went forward under the friendly eyes of Wordsworth, and was finished, offered to Drury Lane, and rejected by the next autumn. Remembering the letter of that November night at Cambridge, one looks to see the mark of *Die Räuber* writ large on this new tragedy, but the trace is none too clearly defined. The play had set light to Coleridge's flaming imagination and the fire had run far from the spot where it started and only a few glowing spots remained. Ordonio, the treacherous brother in *Remorse*, was a fellow disciple with Oswald in the school of Franz Moor. A cruel and deceitful nature, he is filled with jealous hatred of his brother, and attempts by fair means—or foul when necessity compels—to rid himself of Alvar. Their father is hoodwinked, and a tool for the ignoble work is found in the Moor, Isidore, who is bound servant to Ordonio by ties of gratitude. Meanwhile Ordonio justifies himself by would-be logical arguments. Of what import is right or conscience in the world? The fault, if any, lies in the nature of human character. 'What have I done but that which nature destined, Or the blind elements stirred up within me. If good were meant, why were we made these beings[1]?' The elder brother has something of the dignity of Karl without his energy, and the points of resemblance are those which bring out the quieter traits and the more pathetic incidents of his life: his return as an unknown stranger to his home, the meeting

[1] *Remorse*, II, 1. Legouis traces the philosophy of Ordonio to Wordsworth's play. 'A flagrant piece of imitation, which begins at the very point in his tragedy where Coleridge had stopped before he became acquainted with the *Borderers*.' Probably the speech of Ordonio in III, 2: 'Hatred—love: fancies opposed by fancies' has proved misleading. Already in the second act, similar cynical and fatalistic doctrine shows itself. Probably the similarity is due to the common influence of Schiller.

with his betrothed in uncertainty whether she has remained faithful to him, his susceptibility to the influence of Nature in its peaceful moods. The scene in which Karl watches the sunset by the Danube roused the keenest enthusiasm in Schiller-worshippers. Coleridge, with his own intense love of nature living in daily companionship with Wordsworth at the time of writing, was particularly sensitive to its beauty. Alhadra, the Moorish patriot, watches the Autumn woods, flame-coloured and beautiful, and feels the bitterness of indignation steal from her, leaving her at peace, since this earthly vision of the divine dwarfs her human anger into insignificance :

> You hanging woods most lovely in decay,
> Lie in the silent moonshine, and the owl
> Sole voice, sole eye in all this world of beauty.
> Why such a thing as I?—Where are these men?
> I need the sympathy of human faces,
> To beat away this deep contempt for all things
> Which quenches my revenge[1].

Even Alvar in his dungeon recalls the beauty of the world, and is lured from pessimistic brooding, that jars dissonant on the harmony of Nature.

The struggle between the two brothers is not forced to the tragic issue of *Die Räuber*. Ordonio does indeed fall in the snare of his own treachery, but Alvar escapes the power, and with it the guilt and downfall, of Karl Moor. The matter of the play that stirred Coleridge to nervous agitation as he read, remained in his memory as fine romantic stuff. The philosophy did not interest him for itself, the politics troubled him not at all[2]. But the thrilling subtlety of Franz's crime, the pathos of Amalia, true to her outlawed lover, endangered, gentle, unyielding, the wild scene of a country in unrest with one heroic figure moving in self-contained power in spite of fire and clamour, these wove themselves anew into a different pattern. No longer charged with indignation, they lured with their own fantasy. Here was a human story tinged with the changing hues of romance.

To Wordsworth then, Schiller's flaming tragedy gave the impulse for a passionate and pitiful enquiry into the secret workings of character, and the strange mingling of good and bad in a single man. Coleridge found it the door to new adventures, where even familiar things were

[1] *Remorse*, IV, 3 (abridged).

[2] In the second version of the play, Coleridge added some references to the wars for freedom in Belgium. However the old challenge to the world's tyrants from *Die Räuber* seems to be less in question than possible reminiscences of *Don Carlos*. But such work is inevitable for a hero lacking occupation in the time of Philip II.

circled with glamour and the air filled with supernatural presences. Less imaginative folk admitted that it was an exciting tale, and were prepared to enjoy exploring ruined castles, or gloating over highway robbers. The commoner form was sufficient for a pedestrian fancy. They took, as such will always take, the gorgeous dress for more than the spirit which ennobles it. Castles with secret rooms behind the wainscot, outlaws who live a gay and perilous life on the road, unhappy victims prisoned in foul dungeons—these things are enough in themselves. What matters it if they have been made to convey higher things? One may enjoy the show while it passes. Psychology is for such as please to study it. The noble outlaw was a figure so enviably picturesque that the life of the freebooter became a not uncommon career for heroes. There was then ample possibility of finding aged unhappy men in caverns and dungeons, and collecting piteous tales of wrongs done or suffered. The fancy developed into a fashion, and the robber appeared constantly in the work of those who, for respectability's sake, disclaimed all knowledge of German plays. Joanna Baillie's *Rayner*, a tragedy that went wrong in the making, deals with a rather indeterminate young nobleman, who has been driven from his inheritance by a forcible uncle. He wanders by unfrequented paths in melancholy fashion, shrinking from observation, till the dare-devil villain Zaterloo discovers him and tries to induce him to despatch the uncle. However in the wood at night, a terrible old man, haunted by remorse, emerges from his hermitage and dissuades him. The villain confesses, and tragedy is averted. The Bohemian forest sheltered some poor creatures, as well as heaven-storming Moors.

Byron's Ulric in *Werner* is a more sturdy, trampling fellow, fine even in appearance; 'Handsome as Hercules ere his first labour, And with a brow of thought beyond his years When in repose, till his eye kindles up In answering yours.' He has sought the bandit life chiefly for the pleasure of peril, because so one may play the part of a man. But his moral sense has been perverted. His father once defended a theft before his son, and Ulric logically carries the teaching to the extreme. A rich noble whose life he saved, falls into his power, and, approaching his lodging by secret corridors, Ulric murders him to obtain the wealth. It is his right, he argues deftly. 'As a stranger I preserved him, and he owed me his life.' Byron claimed the study of the father's retribution in the moral downfall of the son and the problem of the son's culpability under such temptation to be the main theme of his play. But no great subtlety was used to follow out the ideas.

What seems to have attracted him most was the defiant lawless splendour of the man. Ulric's kinship with Milton's Satan, Shelley's Prometheus, Schiller's Moor is real; however the reckless spirit showed itself, he loved it. The dashing outlaw conveyed his feeling as did Manfred's brooding or Cain in his fine rebellion. As in other work he expressed his own defiance in high poetry, so here he expressed himself in the cheap language of an evanescent fashion.

One point however is interesting in *Werner*. Like the German dramatists who developed their ideas from Schiller's, the 'Schicksals-dramatiker,' Byron plays with the thought of fated retribution. Even if he fails to evoke the mysterious horror which is awakened by those stories of punishment falling inevitably on the anniversary of the crime committed, he uses the same technique. Ulric the long-lost son returns to his parents at a critical moment in their fortunes—not however to save the situation, but to show their old sins grown to enormity and rebounding on their heads[1].

What this type of character might become when the writer really seized its nightmare possibilities, appears in *Bertram*. Maturin's hero has all Karl Moor's fierceness, with none of his redeeming self-control and gentle heart. He has taken to the outlaw trade when deprived of his own lands, and meanwhile cultivates a vein of neurotic misanthropy. If Karl Moor in a moment of tense emotion cursed the whole human race, Bertram has made its turpitude a definite creed. Cast on a wild shore by a terrific storm, he turns on the monks who rescue him with the savage snarl: 'Off, ye are men. There's poison in your touch.' To the question of the sympathetic Prior who tries to search his melancholy, 'Why dost thou despond?', he snaps, 'Because I live.' 'Look not so wild' the Prior answers mildly: 'Can we do ought for thee?' 'Yes—plunge me in the waves from which ye snatched me—so will the sin be on your souls, not mine.' He is proud of his wretchedness, flinging the blame on those who made him so; and even in his

[1] *Werner* was derived directly from Miss Lee's *Kruitzner*, in her *Canterbury Tales*. This is a novel of the free adventurous type set in fashion by *Die Räuber*, and supplied Byron with most of his plot, characters, even dialogue and wording. *Blackwood's* attempted to prove him a mere plagiarist, Stoehsel (*Lord Byrons 'Werner' und seine Quelle*) in later days defended his originality. Apparently Byron took much material from Miss Lee, which he modified both by his own invention and some memories of Schiller. Ulric's band who fight against all and sundry, who laud their calling as the one career for men who are not weaklings, know much of Karl Moor's spirit. Also Ulric has a touch of sophistication proceeding from Franz's meditations. Miss Lee's hero murdered to avert consequences—he did not argue. Byron noted in his diary that he 'redde the robbers' in Feb. 1814, about which time the play was largely composed, though not finished till 1821.

sleep, the bare teeth grind and sweat pours from his brow. Nevertheless, the Prior is moved to some admiration, though mixed with terror; and his comment is noteworthy: 'High-hearted man, sublime even in thy guilt.' Karl Moor, though capable of passionate indignation when injustice or abstract wrong touches him, is always gentle and nearly flexible, when face to face with actual men. Bertram's fierce madness does not abate in the presence of those he loves most. He may have moments when he dreams of sending all his desires to the winds; but if he feels at all, it is with bitter violence. The only way of satisfying his love is by the death of Imogene's husband, Aldobrand. He immediately requires Imogene to aid him in the plot, and threatens to kill her young son also if she refuses. No finer chivalry suggests itself to him. Passion has grown morbid through its own hot fever. When the crime is done, when Imogene has died insane, the death of Bertram follows with no shadow of pity mingled with any terror. There is only a sense of relief that the world is rid of an abomination.

It is difficult to be persuaded that anything of emotional sympathy was intended to be called out by the plays of Maturin. They seem much rather to be addressed to the intellect alone, like the weird and terrible art of Poe, only the ingenuity of his work is lacking. It is fairly clear, however, that one is meant to enjoy the nervous thrill that tingles as the story twists and doubles, meeting spectres at every turn. Maturin takes things less seriously than the greater men, and with a more sophisticated mind. The next tragedy, *Fredolfo,* proceeds from sheer toying with the horrific. Everything in its world has gone mad; sanity has no place, or seems a wild exception. Maturin snatches 'the page on which Nature would have written man,' and scrawls it with a pictured devil. Every movement is violent—the characters rush in and out; they struggle, snatch and writhe. When they speak, it is in agony and shuddering; and their agitation, punctuated by sudden changes to complete calm, is echoed by the ever increasing sound of the storm without. The directions both for scenery and personal bearing make instructive and amusing reading. 'The mountains of St Gothard; a tremendous storm; a dark chasm in the rock. Urilda stands in conscious horror. He utters every line with increasing difficulty. She listens with increasing terror. Clinging with a scream of horror. With convulsive emotion. With an exulting shriek. [These follow each other almost immediately.] After enjoying it silently, he bursts into a demoniac laugh. With ghastly significance.' Urilda, the heroine, must be hoarse with screaming long before the play closes, and

fainting fits are everyday occurrences. The crowning point of the malignant irony of Wallenburg, the scorned lover, comes in the last scene, where, during a demoniac struggle in a sanctuary, Adelmer, the accepted lover, on his knees offers his sword and is stabbed with it as he kneels. That was too much. Possibly the audience failed in a sense of humour, but they rose indignantly against the piece.

To such lengths could the appreciation of Moor lead an irresponsible writer. The vehement language of the German develops into more blustering violence still, when the force of the play rests on the word only, not on the conception. All the terrific school learned ranting in their kindergarten.

> Through Arab hosts command me hew my passage,
> And plant the cross, even on the Prophet's tomb.
> Drop, where Charybdis foams, your crown, and bid me
> Retrieve it from the whirlpool's foaming jaws[1].

Nevertheless, it must not be considered that the Germanic tragedy, to invent an adjective, was mainly of this exaggerated type. Lewis indulged fairly freely in these fearful joys, and Maturin, in his wake, amused the world with telling his bad dreams. Apart from these, most of the writers were too serious, or too sentimental, to use such drastic measures. Only so long as a flash of strangeness or of eerie suggestion touched their picture into the picturesque, they were content. The figure of the old Moor, imprisoned by his own son without light or proper food in a miserable dungeon, proved too exciting and pathetic to be ignored. In the *Castle of Montval*[2], the Count has bestowed his superfluous father in a secret dungeon of his château, and avoids the place and its sting to memory. The Countess, visiting the château, hears the rumoured ghost story, which was to preclude discovery. Groans proceed from some unknown recess, and with rare courage (for these plays) she descends a winding stair and finds the languid victim. The incident becomes the central part of the whole tragedy, for, in trying to cover the knowledge of his guilt, the Count brings both himself and his father to ruin. In *Alfonso*, a shapeless play of M. G. Lewis, such an episode appears without much being made out of it. An old father is discovered by a lady in the lower dungeon, a pitiable figure almost beyond recovery; his voice only gives any clue to his identity. But the matter was added simply as an extra flavour in the recipe. The play was a deliberate attempt to prove how pretty it might be to put together things so all unlike each other as Guy Fawkes

[1] *Adelgitha*, M. G. Lewis, II, 1.

[2] By T. Whalley.

and Charlemain's daughter. Of what account was another unattached incident in this compound?

Castles, dungeons, spectres and wretched prisoners worn shadowy with long and dark confinement, were by no means the exclusive property of German drama. Mrs Radcliffe and the romantic novelists had laid claim to them before *Die Räuber* was known in England. But a different temper is to be discerned behind the scenery. English romance was dramatised and resulted in comedy in one of its varieties, limelight and pictorial, or operatic: *Fountainville Forest*, a romantic comedy; *Mysteries of the Castle*, tragi-comic opera; *Edmund, Orphan of the Castle*, called a tragedy, but really only tragi-comedy. The German romances have a sombre motive lacking in Mrs Radcliffe, who was merely amusing herself with mediæval romantic accessories. The Germans were not just dressing up. Mrs Radcliffe visited a ruin in holiday mood. The Germans sought it out, and preferred it in darkness or under grey skies, because it accorded with their temper, discontented with modern things, overcast, not wholly consistent. The 'Sturm und Drang' movement, with its efforts at reform and preference for tragedy, left its impress on German romance, and even in the English variations dim traces of it are visible. The extravagance has a touch of wildness, of passion, of conviction which the comedies have not. *Edmund* with all its castles and spectres is entirely lacking in the almost supernatural thrill of *Bertram*. The first is fantastic simply; the other is really haunted, at least by the ghost of a passionate anger at the imposing of any limits on the free play of the individual mind. The author himself has felt something of the terror that moves his audience. He recounts his absurdities in a voice that shakes.

This connection between politics and romance did not escape all the critics. Canning and Frere, their acute perception of the ridiculous sharpened by hostility and apprehension concerning the ideas, made this sufficiently plain in *The Rovers*. This piece of exquisite caricature aimed with sureness at the central ideas of the pestilent drama. It was a diversion in a political paper declaredly antagonistic to revolutionary ideas—*The Anti-Jacobin*. *The Rovers* is announced as the production of one Mr Higgins, who has learned from the Teutonic school the first essential of his art, a deep sense of the moral duties of the stage. He hopes 'to unhinge the present notions of men with regard to the obligations of society.' His play is propaganda; the story reveals of what kind. 'The Count of Saxe-Weimar, a prince of tyrannical and licentious disposition, has for prime minister a crafty villain Gaspar,

who has risen to his position by ruining and then putting to death Rogero's father. Seizing the opportunity of Rogero's unsanctioned passion for Matilda, he causes him to be imprisoned by the Abbot of Quedlinburgh, a rapacious, savage and sensual priest.' Rogero in captivity still refuses to think his hatred of the vileness of courts too strong. A court must needs be vile—that is axiomatic. 'Whether in this dark abode amidst toads and spiders, or in a royal palace, amid the more loathesome reptiles of a court, would be indifferent to me.' The landlady of the Inn contracts to send food to Rogero daily, and she too knows what courts may be. The waiter who takes the food, is offered bribes from high officials to poison Rogero; but he draws himself up with conscious dignity, and agrees with the landlady that the conscience of a poor man is as valuable as that of a prince, or more so, since it is usually more pure. Those are your political ideas, flings out Mr Higgins—what of your sublimity? You needs must pity a hero 'confined, coffined, cut off from the converse of his fellow men?' Well, there is Rogero lightening the weary eleven years of dungeon life by song accompanied by clanking chains.

> Whene'er with haggard eyes I view
> This dungeon that I'm rotting in
> I think of those companions true
> Who studied with me at the U-
> -niversity of Gottingen
> -niversity of Gottingen.

Despite the title, *The Rovers* derives little from *Die Räuber*. By means of parody or actual quotation, scraps from *Cabal and Love*, *Stella*, *The Stranger*, *Count Benjowsky* are thrown together. No action where impulsive imagination has left sane common-sense behind escapes the writers, no word where sentimentality minces the tones of passion, no trick of technique whose carelessness or daring displeased the critic in the stalls. The various ingredients, each with poignant flavour, were blended with seeming reckless hand but with fine ingenuity into an ideal sauce whose pungent taste might suit the roasted goose.

Nevertheless one need not lay too heavy stress on this matter. The man in the street, even the poet, might be trusted not to share the quick vision of Canning. In Germany revolutionary ideas had much to do in the fashioning of a particular type of hero. In England the political element was not an intentional motive, and the characteristics it induced became dim and vague. The personality of the hero lost something of its purpose and clearness. His figure was felt to be impressive and moving. It was felt that he suffered for a great idea,

but his meaning was but half understood. Thus he came to represent the power of humanity to do great things, whose nature was left pleasantly unspecified. He became a nebulous grandeur, a symbol of strength, beauty and inspiration, which could not fail to put heart into a time that longed to be convinced that there were new worlds to conquer, new visions to dream of, new aims to strive after.

This character came before English audiences most impressively in the figure of Karl Moor, and the enthusiasm with which he was received was tremendous. The other figures of the school of the 'Stürmer und Dränger' were practically unknown in England. No clear idea of the movement ever came here and acquaintance ceased with *Die Räuber* and *Götz*. It was sufficient. In Moor had been recognised that quality which all, by one consent, termed 'greatness.' He possessed a twofold splendour—the power to do and to endure great things. Each gives the other a finer poignancy, for, as he deprives himself of the right to achieve his ideals, so much the more is the suffering he must bear. 'Great actions move our admiration chiefly because they carry in themselves an earnest that we can suffer greatly.' That was it. Human nature was suddenly made of more account. It was finer than the low abasement of compromise revealed it; it was stronger than the timid flinching from difficulty which every day insulted its nobility.

The manner in which *Die Räuber* was universally received seems to argue a certain imaginative inexperience. The kind of youthfulness that made it possible for Coleridge to find sustenance in Bowles' lachrymose sonnets betrays itself as widespread in this other relationship. Not that Schiller invites comparison with Bowles; but there is in the delineation of Karl Moor a certain preoccupation with large things. The small is but commonplace—it never shows its concealed divinity. Experience has not yet learnt the complexity of eddy and resistance that headlong action raises. Emotions that all men know or divine fall on the reader singly, and grip with such painful clutch that no other touch is felt at all. The agony of comradeship bereaved felt by Don Carlos for the dead Posa, the pain of Karl Moor in exile or bidding farewell to Amalia, these numb every other feeling at the time. They fill the world. The older reader perhaps will smile a little and shake his head. 'No, no. Things do not happen like that.' But for the other the emotion is so isolated that, having no other by which to gauge itself, it is immeasurable, and so infinite.

To do and suffer great things. The followers of Schiller tasted some of the joys of the mountaineer; the triumph of scaling the peaks

was deliciously tempered by a shuddering terror of near danger. They fell in love with danger. They leaned over dizzy precipices, till they felt in imagination the whirling fall and sickening crash, as they could never have experienced it in the sudden disaster of reality. They explored the craters of live volcanoes and snuffed the fumes of a very Inferno. The fascination of this study of the terrible appears with less morbidity than usual in John Wilson's *City of the Plague*. The idea of strength in the hero is not felt but simply horror, and awe at the tremendousness of fate. There is little action. The piece is a detailed and vivid description of a great calamity. The hero comes back to London in the plague year, having been absent for some period, and searches for his friends. The scenes offer different aspects of the city, the terrified sufferers, the quack dispensing cures, the heroine passing through it all with serenity. The play offers a strange parallel with Gerstenberg's *Ugolino*, and follows the same dramatic method. One vivid picture succeeds another without any very definite connection but the rising sense of horror, till in the end nothing is left but the presence of death.

The lure of the terrible proved itself in some unexpected ways. Appreciation of the Elizabethans, and of Shakespeare in particular, was strongly biassed by this trend of thought. The Shakespearian tragedies most popular were those that dealt with the problem of pain in the most overwhelming form, that studied evil in its most hateful aspect of reasoning coolness: *Lear*, *Richard III* and *Othello*. The plays appeared quite frequently on the stage, and it is noticeable that, in *Othello*, the greatest fascination proceeded from Iago. The great actors constantly studied that character and that of Richard. Hamlet was not the object of attention to anything like the same extent.

The marks on the true coin will be copied on the counterfeit. The Shakespearian forgery *Vortigern* drew its plot largely from *Richard III* and *Macbeth*; and in the event of a case of madness Lear took precedence of Ophelia as a model. Where memories of Shakespeare are woven in with material of German manufacture they are almost inevitably drawn from these particular plays. The author of *Lorenzo*[1], an adaptation of *Die Räuber*, speaks freely of Francis Moor as a 'domestic Richard,' and where his fluency in translation threatens to run thin or short he refills the volume of it from the royal forerunner's speech. Sometimes a proud claim is made that the play is of the same emotional

[1] Published 1823 anonymously. Written about 1815.

type as one of these Shakespearian tragedies. '*Bertram* drew no tears. The answer is obvious. Would it not be reckoned as irrelevant criticism to say that no one weeps for Macbeth or Richard III?'[1]

Even good work shows itself not wholly free from such temptations. In *The Borderers*, the villain wears his German costume with a touch of Iago's style, so that he and the hero surprise themselves acting a portion of *Othello*; and *The Cenci*, needing to borrow neither force nor motive, recalls now and then phrases of these three tragedies.

The terrible, viewed by the weaker brethren, induced a certain morbidity. The idea of fruitless remorse, already present in *The Borderers*, became accentuated, and the passing sunset mood of Moor became the whole motive of a race of brooding heroes. They live in wilful despondency, thrusting aside the impulse to effort of any sort. Julian, in Sotheby's *Julian and Agnes*, lives as a lay brother in an Alpine monastery. He keeps apart from the brothers in voluntary humiliation; he gives one to understand that his crimes are too huge to allow of equal converse with men. The story, we learn, is much that of Romola and Tito; but Agnes, his Romola, is willing to forget. She wastes herself on the feeble creature. However Julian derives no little satisfaction from being, like Uriah Heep, 'umble. 'Peace—never, Agnes; 'tis virtue's heritage. Guilt, guilt is on me.' Julian is a poor thing, but he follows the fashion of his betters.

For all minds, strong and weak alike, whether the manner was grand or morbid or absurd, Karl Moor determined the type of the heroic for many years. No outfit was complete without such bare necessities as rebellion, remorse, suffering and solitude magnificently endured. The Byronic hero absorbed many of these ideas, probably not so much by definite contact, as through the diffused influence of the time. A good deal of conventional posturing clung about him, though it is not easy to prove that this too did not proceed from the theatrical strain in Byron's own character. 'Er schreibt sich selber aus, während er andere zu kopieren scheint.' Manfred shows more of the paralysing influence of remorse, Cain more of the splendid baffled idealism; yet both originated from a similar idea. Manfred is great in aspect as 'a magnified image in the fog.' His despair has nevertheless more in it than mere attitudinising in the limelight. His vast egotism, his self-conscious comparison of his state with that of the fallen Lucifer, the hectoring vein in which he assumes the dress of Bertram to die in,

[1] Preface to *Manuel*, by Maturin, 1817. The play derives much material from *King Lear*.

as in the middle ages men wore the habit of some monastic order at the last, none of these can wholly mask the finer spirit which has seen the better, and tortures itself because its own act has put away the hope of possession[1].

We should have expected the political motive in Schiller to appeal to Byron; but no such definite connection does appear. When Byron turned to history, he was hampered by his theories of drama, and the result is very unlike Schiller. Marino Faliero seized remedies as desperate as those resorted to by Moor, but his motive was personal, not altruistic, vengeance; and at the end, he finds peace only in the thought that time may yet avenge him in making the fine city 'a desolation and a curse.' Nothing more than the outline of the heaven-storming hero is retained. Definite borrowing, and a clear likeness appear in *Werner*, but that piece of flashy, uninspired work is not serious enough to bear the weight of political earnestness.

Perhaps the most sympathetic reception of the type was by Shelley. The influence of *Die Räuber* on him was inward, moulding his ideas rather than the superficial presentment of them. There existed a great kinship between the character and philosophy of the two poets—in spite of wide difference of manner. Shelley had the same rebellion against the present circumstances of the world which Schiller felt in his early years: *he* would understand the temper of *Die Räuber* if all the rest of the world saw it partially or vaguely. The challenge flung at the conventional way of solving social problems, the sharp sense of separation from the rest of humanity by a great wrong, found their most powerful and glorious expression in *Prometheus* and *The Cenci*. Here the influence has proved really fertile in the only way which could produce such fine work: it has permeated the soil from which the poems spring, so that, without any external resemblance, there is evidence that the life within is one with it.

In *Prometheus*, the problem of the hero who defies the existing order to gain some good, almost despaired of, is taken up. He is destined to undergo extraordinary punishment for the attempt, cut off from the world in the solitude of mountain heights. But the poem carries the problem on, so that it comes out, as it were, on the other side of tragedy. It is like a curve which passes through infinity and comes back reversed. After all, Prometheus was demanding something

[1] A general parallel can be shown between Byron's hero-type and Milton's Satan. Kräger notes that Schiller's Moor has also many traits from the English source. It is as impossible as unnecessary to disentangle what each writer owed to the others in a matter like this. The conception remains clear and significant.

right. Although his destiny was to suffer, in the end his demand was justified, and the problem which in common earthly tragedy ends in non-fulfilment is brought to a solution.

The Cenci attacks the same problem, no longer as a principle, but materialised in actual history. The complaint against tyranny is still insistent. It is the burden of all Shelley's work. Here it recurs in the most terrible and agonising form. That Shelley should have dared to choose such a form reveals something of the strength of the influence. The plot was not made gratuitously terrible. The exaggeration of the adverse circumstances under which the hero labours was a distinct tendency of the school in England. Shelley pushed with the most extravagant to the very limits of endurance and only by the intensity of his idealising imagination made the position bearable. However it may be obscured, Beatrice's demand to right the wrongs of tyranny by taking the law into her own hands, her reiterated avowal that she is justified in doing so, repeat the same idea. If it had not been for the school of *Die Räuber*, the situation of *The Cenci* would have been practically impossible.

The story closes on its finest chapter. The characters of the *Borderers* were never really alive. Nothing in *Remorse* is permanent but one fragment of song. The rant of Bertram was lost in the rhetoric of *Manfred*. At last out of the turbulence emerged the quiet voice of Beatrice Cenci ending her tragedy in lofty composure:

> Here, mother, tie
> My girdle for me, and bind up this hair
> In any simple knot; ay, that does well.
> And yours, I see, is coming down. How often
> Have we done this for one another; now
> We shall not do it any more. My Lord,
> We are quite ready.

MARGARET W. COOKE.

LONDON.

'PRÉCIOSITÉ' AFTER 'LES PRÉCIEUSES RIDICULES[1].'

II.

Of the men of letters who frequented these *précieux* salons none are now of much account; some, indeed, are only known from a single line of Boileau's. But in their own day they stood high in public estimation. All, except Mascaron, Montausier, and Ménage, were members of the Academy, and Ménage was only excluded by reason of his irreverent satire, *La Requête des Dictionnaires.* So far was *Les Précieuses ridicules* from having crushed *préciosité* that during the whole decade from 1660 to 1670 Molière and his friends had to fight battle after battle. The success of *L'École des Femmes* in December 1662 provoked a campaign of fifteen months. The struggle for *Tartuffe*, which began in 1664, lasted five years. But in 1665 the allies gained with Racine's *Alexandre* another success, which was repeated with his *Andromaque* (1667). In the same year, 1665, Boileau wrote and circulated in manuscript his satirical dialogue, *Les héros du roman.* In 1666 Furetière published his *Roman bourgeois*, and Boileau the first edition of his *Satires* (I—VII). It was now Boileau's turn to bear the brunt of the battle. For three years he suffered the feeble onslaughts of Cotin, and Coras, and Boursault[2], and then he attacked them, first with the Eighth Satire (1668), and again in the same year with the Ninth, 'ce terrible abatage de réputations' (Lanson), in which hardly one of his opponents escapes punishment.

But though Boileau and his friends were rapidly gaining ground in public reputation, their opponents still held the Academy. In 1670 they were reinforced by Quinault, and in the following year by Charles Perrault, and at this time they must have numbered nearly half the whole body. At last in 1673 the battle was won, and Racine

Continued from p. 47.

[2] These are enumerated by Lanson, *Hist. de la litt. française*, 5th ed., p. 491 n. 1.

entered the fortress. It is true that the *précieux* Fléchier entered with him, but the breach had been made. In the following year (1674) the 'old guard' began to drop off. Chapelain, 'the head of the French Parnassus,' whose influence with Colbert in the delicate task of distributing pensions to men of letters had never been shaken, died in that year. Conrart, another of the original eight, followed in 1675, and Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin in 1676. Chapelain was succeeded by Benserade, and Gomberville, another of the 'old guard,' who died in the same year, by Huet, but Conrart's place fell to Toussaint Rose, a friend of Molière and Boileau, and one of the four secretaries of the royal cabinet. Well-read and witty, free-spoken to audacity, and entirely in the king's confidence, he could render considerable service to the new poets[1].

One source of strength to the old school in the Academy was the remarkable longevity of its representatives[2]. Cotin lived till 1682, Pellisson till 1693, Benserade till 1694. Indeed, almost the only one who did not die a septuagenarian was Quinault. But in 1673 the tide began to turn with the admission of Racine, and though in the same year the new school suffered a grievous blow by the death of Molière, Boileau scored a fresh success. Two years before this Chapelain backed up by Perrault had obtained from Colbert the withdrawal of the privilege for the *Satires*[3]. Now a month or two after Chapelain's death (Feb. 24) there appeared a new edition of Boileau's works with a new privilege, dated March 28, which was couched in unusually flattering terms. The edition included, among other novelties, the *Art poétique*, the poetical code of the new school. In the same year Pierre Perrault published a defence of Quinault's *Alceste*, which Racine in the course of his preface to *Iphigénie* answered as follows: 'Je conseille à ces messieurs de ne plus décider si légèrement sur les ouvrages des anciens. Un homme tel qu'Euripide méritoit au moins qu'ils l'examinassent.' Boileau was not far wrong when he said, 'Racine est beaucoup plus malin que moi[4].'

Iphigénie had been highly successful, first at Versailles, where it was produced in August, 1674, and then at Paris, where it was given in the following January. A rival play with the same title, written by the

[1] For his portrait see Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, II, 422–3.

[2] 'Il est d'usage de vivre longtemps à l'Académie...Mais il résulta de cette longévité académique que, dans la seconde moitié du XVII[e] siècle, l'Académie ne se renouvela point aussi vite que le public l'aurait pu souhaiter' (Sainte-Beuve, *Caus. du Lundi*, IV, 224).

[3] G. Collas, *Jean Chapelain*, 1912.

[4] D'Alembert, *Hist. des membres de l'A. F.*, III, 140.

Academician, Michel Le Clerc[1], with the assistance of Coras, whose name is only known from a line of Boileau's, was a complete failure. But Racine's success roused his enemies to a fresh effort, and a new attack was carefully prepared in another quarter. Its authors were the Duchesse de Bouillon, her brother, the Duc de Nevers, and Mme Deshoulières. How Mme Deshoulières, having heard that Racine was engaged upon a new tragedy on the subject of Phaedra and Hippolytus, persuaded a young provincial, named Nicolas Pradon, who two years previously had made his *début* on the Parisian stage with the tragedy of *Pyrame et Thisbé* (1674), to write a play on the same subject and with the same title as Racine's[2]; how Racine's play was produced at the Hôtel de Bourgogne on the first of January, 1677, and Pradon's at the Hôtel Guénégaud on the third; how Mme de Bouillon at the cost of 15,000 *livres* secured every seat in both theatres for the first six representations of each play; how in consequence Racine's tragedy was received in cold silence, and Pradon's with tumultuous applause; how Mme Deshoulières and her friends on one side, and Racine and Boileau and their friends on the other wrote injurious sonnets; how Nevers threatened Boileau and Racine with *coups de bâton*; and how the great Condé took them under his protection and warned Nevers that he should regard any insult to his two friends as a personal matter—all this has often been told and need not be repeated here[3].

In the year 1680 the old school received an important recruit in the person of Bernard Le Bouyer[4] de Fontenelle, who came from Rouen to Paris to take up his abode in the Rue de Cléry with his two uncles, Pierre and Thomas Corneille. Three years before this he had made his literary *début*, so far as the capital was concerned, with a poem entitled *Amour noyé*, which had appeared in the May volume of *Le nouveau*

[1] 1622–1691; admitted to the Academy in 1662.

[2] The original title of Racine's play was *Phèdre et Hippolyte*.

[3] See F. Deltour, *Les ennemis de Racine*, 1859, pp. 331—341; Racine, *Œuvres*, ed. P. Mesnard, I, 253—255 (L. Racine, *Mémoires*). In the version of the story which was told to Brossette by Mlle Deshoulières in 1711 (see Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, XIII, 387–8) nothing is said about the Duchesse de Bouillon buying up all the seats. For the sonnets, which Deltour does not print in full, see the article on Nevers in the *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* That in which Racine and his friends attacked Nevers, believing him to be the author of the sonnet on Phèdre, has the following lines:

> La Muse, par malheur, le hait autant qu'il aime.
> Il a d'un franc poète et l'air et le maintien,
> Il veut juger de tout, et n'en juge pas bien,
> Il a pour le phébus une tendresse extrême.

[4] This form of the name, which is the original one, is the one adopted in the Catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale. It was pronounced, as it is often written, Le Bovier. See L'Abbé Trublet, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de M^r de Fontenelle*, 2nd ed., Amsterdam, 1759.

Mercure galant, heralded by a friendly editorial puff. He had also made a more serious contribution to letters by collaborating with his uncle, Thomas Corneille, in a couple of operas, *Psyche* (1678) and *Bellérophon*, for which Lulli wrote the music. In the first year of his residence at Paris he produced a tragedy, *Aspar*, but it was a complete failure, and even its name only survives in an epigram of Racine's[1]. On the other hand, two prose works, the *Dialogues des Morts* and the *Lettres gallantes du Comte d'Her****[2], both published in 1683, had a decided success. He was also at this time an active contributor to the *Mercure galant*, which under his influence and that of Thomas Corneille—the latter since 1681 had been associated in its management with the original editor, Jean Donneau de Visé—had become the organ of the Rue de Cléry and the *précieux* school[3].

In 1684 Boileau and La Fontaine were at last admitted to the Academy. When one considers how many of his future *confrères* Boileau had insulted in his verse it is not surprising that he had to wait for his election till his forty-eighth year. The great Corneille died in the same year (1684), and his place in the Academy was taken by his younger brother, Thomas, who would certainly have been admitted long before this but for the rule against two brothers being members at the same time. There was another vacant place, which was destined for Ménage, but through the powerful influence of the Colbert family it was given to Jean-Louis Bergeret, who had not written a line, but who had been *premier commis* to Colbert de Croissy and was now one of the four secretaries of the Cabinet[4].

In 1687 Charles Perrault read before the Academy his poem on *Le Siècle de Louis le Grand*, which so scandalised Boileau and Racine, and which gave rise to the famous quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns. It may seem a paradox that the party in the Academy which has here been designated as the old school and which looked back to the days of Richelieu and Mazarin should now have become the party of the future. But so it was. The Moderns were not only a majority in the Academy, but they had with them the larger half of society, especially of the

[1] *Œuvres*, IV, 183; *The Oxford Book of French Verse*, ed. Lucas, p. 196.

[2] This is the title of the 3rd edition (1699); the original title was *Lettres diverses*, etc.

[3] During the first two years of its life (January 1672—December 1673) the *Mercure galant* (4 vols., 12mo) had no special literary bias. It prints poems by Mlle Deshoulières, has a favourable notice of *Les Femmes savantes*, and publishes appreciative verses and an *oraison funèbre* on Molière after his death. After an interval of over three years *Le nouveau Mercure galant* appeared in March 1677, and henceforth a 12mo volume was published every month. In March 1678 the number of pages in each volume was increased from about 150 to 200.

[4] Pellisson and Olivet, *Hist. de l'A. F.*, II, 295.

women. Further, and this is the important point, it was chiefly they who determined the future of French literature. In their ranks were to be found, with only a few exceptions, such as Huet and Ménage, all the *précieux* and all those who held to the traditions of Corneille and Voiture.

The first to enter the lists in support of Perrault was Fontenelle, whose clever but superficial little treatise, *Digression sur les Anciens et les Modernes*, appeared in January, 1688, as an appendix to his *Poésies pastorales*. In the same year he was a candidate for the Academy. Though only thirty-one, he had achieved a considerable reputation, not only by the writings already noticed, but by two far superior works, *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes* and *Histoire des Oracles*, both of which were published in 1686. But, largely owing to the opposition of Boileau and Racine, who disliked him for three reasons—first because he was a nephew of the Corneilles, secondly because he was a Modern, and thirdly because he was a *bel-esprit*—he was unsuccessful on this and three subsequent occasions.

The literary claims of the four men who were preferred to him were of the slenderest. Testu de Mauroy had been tutor to Monsieur's daughters, and was practically imposed upon the Academy by Monsieur. Jean de La Chapelle owed his election to his services as a diplomatist and his excellent dinners. Eusèbe Renaudot was, it is true, a man of considerable learning in theology and oriental languages, but he had published nothing. François de Callières, another diplomatist, was the author of a *Panégyrique historique de Louis XIV*, which led D'Alembert to say that 'he had forced the doors of the Academy.' But he had a better claim in his *Histoire poétique de la guerre nouvellement déclarée entre les anciens et les modernes* (1688), which had the rare fortune to be applauded in both camps[1]. At his fifth attempt Fontenelle was successful, and in the same year (1691)[2] Étienne Pavillon, who was regarded as the Voiture of his day, was unexpectedly but appropriately chosen to fill the seat of Benserade. The next Academician, Jacques de Tourreil, the translator of Demosthenes, belonged decidedly to the *précieux* school. 'Le bourreau!' said Racine of him, 'il fera tant qu'il donnera de l'esprit à Démosthène[3].'

[1] H. Rigault, *Histoire de la querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, 1859, pp. 213—216. For the relationship between Callières's work and Swift's *Battle of the Books* see H. Craik, *Life of Swift*, 2nd ed., 1894, pp. 90—92; he corrects the errors of his illustrious predecessors, Johnson and Scott.

[2] For a *chanson* on his *discours de réception* see Racine, *Œuvres*, IV, 244—248.

[3] Pellisson and Olivet, II, 110.

The elections of 1693 were as notable as those of 1684, for they resulted in the admission of Fénelon and La Bruyère. Fénelon, whose taste had been formed on the masterpieces of antiquity, valued above all things simplicity, and in his *discours de réception* he summed up the progress which literature, and especially style, had made in the forty years which had elapsed since the publication of his predecessor Pellisson's history of the Academy as being one from affectation to simplicity, from the search after *esprit* to the truthful representation of nature[1]. But he was too independent of parties, too much of an individualist, to take sides in the great quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns[2].

La Bruyère, on the other hand, was the stoutest of partisans. Already in *Les Caractères* he had sounded the note of battle by a scathing attack on *Le Mercure galant*—'Le H*** [Hermès] G*** est immédiament au-dessous de rien'—and by holding the balance between Corneille and Racine. Further in the sixth edition (1691) he had introduced an easily recognised portrait of Benserade under the name of Théobalde, poet and *bel-esprit*. On Benserade's death a few months later, he had, not very wisely, become a candidate for his seat in the Academy, but had received only seven votes. His election two years later was largely due, it was said, to the support of Ponchartrain, the Chancellor, who had written a letter in his favour. His *discours de réception*, which was delivered to none too friendly an audience, was novel, haughty, and aggressive. After praising in turn Regnier-Desmarets (the secretary), Segrais, La Fontaine, Boileau, Racine, Bossuet, and Fénelon[3], he dismissed the rest, who were no doubt eagerly waiting their turn, with a general and perfunctory compliment. He concluded with a sharp attack on those who had tried to injure him by 'false and malignant attributions' of his portraits. The *Mercure galant* replied with an article, written either by Fontenelle or the editor, attacking both the discourse and the *Caractères*. Whereupon La Bruyère took an ample revenge by printing his *discours*, to which he prefixed an able and militant preface, in the eighth edition (1693) of his book, and by inserting in the chapter *On Society and Conversation* the well-known portrait of Fontenelle under the name of Cydias.

[1] Cp. 'Les anciens ont évité l'écueil du bel-esprit, où les Italiens modernes sont tombés, et dont la contagion s'est fait un peu sentir à plusieurs de nos écrivains d'ailleurs très distingués.' (*Lettre sur les anciens et les modernes.*)

[2] In the above letter his attitude is one of dignified neutrality.

[3] M. Morillot conjectures it was six of these who with Bassy-Rabutin (since dead) voted for him in 1691. (*La Bruyère* in *Les grands écrivains français.*)

Ascagne est statuaire, Hégion fondeur, Æschine fouleur, et Cydias bel esprit ; c'est sa profession.... C'est, en un mot, un composé du pédant et du précieux, fait pour être admiré de la bourgeoisie et de la province, en qui néanmoins on n'aperçoit rien de grand que l'opinion qu'il a de lui-même.

The concluding sentence is evidently inspired not merely by La Bruyère's personal animosity against Fontenelle, but also by his genuine dislike of *préciosité*. He hated Fontenelle both as an individual and as a type. The next 'remark' but one to the portrait of Théobalde runs as follows:

Il a régné pendant quelque temps une sorte de conversation fade et puérile, qui roulait toute sur des questions frivoles qui avaient relation au cœur et à ce qu'on appelle passion ou tendresse. La lecture de quelques romans les avait introduites parmi les plus honnêtes gens de la ville et de la cour ; ils s'en sont défaits, et la bourgeoisie les a reçues, avec les pointes et les équivoques ;

and that which precedes the same portrait concludes with the words:

Il ne fallait, pour fournir à ces entretiens, ni bon sens, ni jugement, ni mémoire, ni la moindre capacité ; il fallait de l'esprit, non pas du meilleur, mais de celui qui est faux, et où l'imagination a trop de part[1].

The portrait of Cydias is manifestly unjust, for it completely ignores the better and greater Fontenelle, the author of that *Histoire des Oracles* which, in the words of M. Maigron, 'contains the whole of the eighteenth century in advance.' But it also misses the distinction between Fontenelle's *préciosité* and that of a *bel-esprit* of an older generation, such as, for instance, Benserade. It could not be said of Fontenelle's *esprit* either that it was 'false or that imagination had too large a share in it,' for he was wholly devoid of imagination.

When this portrait appeared in print, the *ruelles* which had been at once the source and the strength of the *précieux* spirit, had practically lost their importance. Mme Deshoulières, who had been seriously ill ever since 1682, died in 1694. A few weeks later Boileau published his Tenth Satire (written in 1692) in which he attacked her as one of the last of the *précieuses*[2]. Her friend Mlle de Scudéry lived, it is true, till 1701, but at the time of her death she was ninety-four, and though in her later years she was still visited by numerous admirers, she no longer held a salon. As for the *beaux-esprits* who had paid court to her, they were either dead or had betaken themselves to more serious occupations than that of writing *Stances à Iris* or carrying on a *joli commerce en prose et vers*. Quinault died in 1691, Benserade in

[1] Both of these 'remarks' appeared in the original edition.

[2] See above p. 40. Mme Deshoulières died on February 17, and the printing of the Tenth Satire was finished on March 4.

1691, François Tallemant in 1693. Huet, Mascaron, and Fléchier were busy with the care of their sees. Perrault was writing his charming fairy-tales and his *Parallèles des anciens et des modernes*. Segrais lived at Caen and seldom came to Paris. The Abbé Testu was chiefly occupied with his ambitions, his vapours, and his sleeplessness. Only Thomas Corneille, Paul Tallemant, and Testu de Mauroy were left among the older representatives of the *précieux* school.

It was the same with those more aristocratic salons in which *préciosité* had obtained a footing. The Duchesse de Richelieu, of whose hôtel the Abbé Testu had aspired to be the Voiture, died in 1696. Long before this the allied salon of the Maréchale d'Albret had closed its doors[1]. The most famous Paris salon of the later years of the seventeenth century, where young men of fashion formed their manners, was anything but a school of *préciosité*, for it was that of Ninon de Lenclos[2].

On the other hand, the collections of verse which, as we have seen, were highly characteristic of the *précieux* movement began to make their re-appearance in the last decade of the century. A new edition of *La Suze-Pellisson* was published in 1691. Though not so complete as that of 1674, it is thoroughly representative of the school; among its new pieces, it may be observed, are several in prose and some in prose interspersed with verse. In the following year (1692) Barbin published in five volumes an anthology of verse from Villon to Benserade, upon which, as Saint-Beuve remarks, the school of Louis XIV has left absolutely no trace. The fifth volume contains no less than 128 pieces by Benserade. Though his name does not appear, there seems to be no doubt that the editor was Fontenelle[3].

The *précieux* school is also well represented in the little volume entitled *Recueil de vers choisis* which was edited by the Père Bouhours in 1693. But this amiable Jesuit was by no means the *docteur du précieux* that Nisard represents him to be[4]. It is true that he attended the Saturdays of Mlle de Scudéry and sent her little offerings at the New Year, but he had a footing in both camps, and he remained to the end of his life in friendly relations with Boileau. His *La Manière de bien penser dans les Ouvrages d'esprit* is in much closer accord with the *Art*

[1] The Maréchal, who survived his wife, died in 1676.

[2] The *éclat* of her salon lasted from about 1665 to 1700. She died in 1705, at the age of ninety.

[3] *Recueil des plus belles pièces des Poëtes français depuis Villon jusqu'à Benserade*, 5 vols., 1692 (see Lachèvre, III). For Fontenelle's connexion with this work see Trublet, *Mémoires pour servir*, etc., pp. 72—74 and 292.

[4] See *Hist. de la litt. française*, IV, 52—67.

poétique than with the *précieux* school, nor is there the slightest touch of affectation in its admirable style[1].

In the year following the publication of Bouhours' *Recueil* the Hague bookseller, Adrian Moëtjens, brought out a volume entitled, *Recueil de pièces curieuses et nouvelles tant en prose qu'en vers*, in which Perrault's verse fairy-tales, *Peau d'Âne* and *Les Souhaits ridicules*, are printed for the first time. It also includes three *histoires galantes*, a species of literature which had recently become highly popular. The stories, all more or less scandalous, pretended to be historical, and were written for the most part by ladies of damaged virtue, such as Mlle de La Force and Mme de Murat. The remaining four volumes of Moëtjens's *Recueil*, which were published in parts down to 1701, all contained *histoires galantes*, and in the last volume Perrault's prose fairy-tales made their first appearance[2]. As for the verse, the authors who are represented by the greatest number of pieces are the Marquis de Coulanges[3], Mme Deshoulières, and her daughter.

In 1698 a bookseller named Vertron published a volume of exclusively feminine verse, with contributions by Mlle de Scudéry, Mme Deshoulières, and a troop of obscure ladies. It was entitled *La nouvelle Pandore ou les femmes illustres du Siècle de Louis XIV*. In the same year appeared *Recueil des plus belles épigrammes des poëtes françois depuis Marot jusqu'à présent*[4]. Marot was in considerable favour at this time, and it was the fashion to write *poésie marotique* in would-be archaic language. Among the old poet's admirers was the Mâcon poet Sénecé (1643–1737), who published in 1688 *Lettre de Clément Marot*, a long narrative supposed to have been written from the Elysian fields in the preceding year. It is in the manner of Mlle de Scudéry's romances, and reveals the writer as an adept in the cold ingenuities of the *précieux* school[5]. The *gaulois* side of Marot may not have appealed to this worthy provincial, but it certainly did to the Epicurean society which supped at the hôtel of the Grand Prior of Vendôme[6]. His brother, the Duc de Vendôme,

[1] See G. Doncieux, *Le Père Bouhours*, 1886.

[2] *La ville au bois dormant* in the 2nd part (1696), the rest in the 4th part (1697). Each volume of the *Recueil* contained six parts (see Lachèvre, III, 126–7).

[3] He published a collection of his songs, *Recueil de chansons*, in 1698.

[4] In two volumes, but the second contains nothing but Racan's poetry. For all these *Recueils* see Lachèvre, *op. cit.*, vol. III.

[5] For Sénecé see Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, XII, 280 ff.

[6]
Il est un lieu près du Marais,
Où depuis quelque temps le genre marotique
Se renouvelle avec succès.
Emprunter les nouveaux attraits
Que l'on trouve à son air antique:

delighted in *chansons* and *vers badins*, and in Chaulieu and La Fare he had poets who could accommodate his taste. Taken in conjunction with the vogue of *aventures galantes* referred to above, this cult of Marot indicates that, in some circles at any rate, the *esprit précieux* was giving ground before the *esprit gaulois*[1].

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

> De Ronsard ou de Rabelais
> Instruisez-vous dans la boutique,
> Il ne faut que cinq ou six traits
> D'un langage obscur et gothique
> Pour divertir à peu de frais.
>
> Hamilton, *Épitre à Grammont* (*Œuvres*, III).

[1] Voltaire says of *le style marotique* that it is 'très propre aux contes cyniques et à l'épigramme.' (*Mémoire sur la satire* (1739), *Œuvres*, XXXVIII, 337.)

INFLUENCE OF WALT WHITMAN ON THE ORIGIN OF THE 'VERS LIBRE.'

THE difficult question of the origin of the *vers libre*, as yet unillumined by thorough investigation, has been made more obscure by a diversity of partial solutions. The free verse movement in France is generally dated from the appearance in 1887 of M. Gustave Kahn's *Palais nomades*. M. Kahn considers himself the author, and is undeniably the theoriser of the innovation; though it is held that he was preceded in this direction by his friend Jules Laforgue. In his *Rapport sur le Mouvement poétique français*, Catulle Mendès gives the names of some half dozen 'originators'; but his ironical remarks on the free verse movement, with which he was entirely out of sympathy, are not to be taken seriously. M. Robert de Souza, who has made a scientific study of French rhythm mainly from the standpoint of accentuation, traces the origin of the recent 'innovations' back to the mediaeval fountain-head of French versification, and has consequently little to say about the would-be originators of the eighties. While agreeing with this scientific explanation, many of the best *verslibristes* are content to cite, as the initial inspiration of their own free verse, the *vers libéré* of Paul Verlaine. In the important preface to *Palais nomades*, M. Kahn explains his own experiment as the culmination of the development of poetic prose from Chateaubriand to Baudelaire and of the prose-poem from Baudelaire to Mallarmé.

There is probably a large element of truth in all these points of view. But the question cannot be settled without taking into account another suggestion of a different character, namely that modern French free verse owes its origin partly, if not primarily, to foreign influence. This opinion owes something to the fact that a large percentage of the early *verslibristes* were of foreign extraction. 'Je remarque avec assez d'étonnement,' said José-Maria de Hérédia, 'que ce sont des Belges, des Suisses, des Grecs, des Anglais et des Américains qui veulent

renouveler le vers français[1].' M. Vielé-Griffin, one of the most prominent (and certainly the most consistent) of *verslibristes*, is an American by birth. Many of his comrades in the Symbolist campaign appreciated the freedom and flexibility of English and German versifications; and it has even been suggested that the free, line for line translations made from foreign poets in the early days of Symbolism gave an impulse to the new ventures in French prosody.

In this connection Whitman's name has been brought forward. Though it happens that some of the *Leaves of Grass* were rendered into French about the time when the first free verses appeared, a direct influence in his case has never been seriously maintained. None of the principal studies of the Symbolist movement refers to Whitman; hence anyone conversant with the trend of French versification since Verlaine cannot but be surprised to find so recent and authoritative a publication as *Les Poètes d'Aujourd'hui* suggesting that Whitman's influence was a factor. 'M. Gustave Kahn,' we there read, 'est un poète du vers libre. Il a même passé à une certaine époque pour l'avoir inventé, et lui-même n'est pas loin de le croire. On a prétendu d'autre part, que le mérite de cette innovation revenait à Jules Laforgue. Arthur Rimbaud se l'est vue également attribuer, et il n'est pas jusqu'à une poétesse montmartroise, Mme Marie Krysinska, qui n'ait réclamé cette gloire pour son propre compte. C'est là une question qui n'est pas encore bien tranchée et le vers libre, en admettant qu'il n'ait pas toujours existé plus ou moins, n'a peut-être été tout d'abord, sous sa forme actuelle, qu'un des résultats de l'influence de poètes étrangers, notamment du poète américain Walt Whitman, très apprécié des écrivains symbolistes[2].' Exceptional as this point of view now is, it has been held by other writers, one of whom is in the front rank of contemporary French critics. M. Remy de Gourmont writes: 'A qui doit-on le vers libre?...surtout à Walt Whitman dont on commençait alors à goûter la licence majestueuse[3]'; and again: 'On traduisait également vers 1883 quelques poèmes de Walt Whitman dont la libre rythmique ne fut pas sans influence sur le mouvement symboliste et la création du vers libre[4].' An American writer, Vance Thompson, in a book on the Symbolist poets says: 'And just as Poe created modern French prose, Whitman re-created modern French verse[5].'

[1] M. Huret, *Enquête sur la littérature contemporaine*, p. 293. Catulle Mendès made a similar remark, p. 307, *ibid.*

[2] Van Bever and Léautaud, *Poètes d'Aujourd'hui*, vol. I, p. 203.

[3] *Promenades littéraires* (1885—1886), p. 245.

[4] *Promenades littéraires* (1904), see *La littérature anglaise en France*, p. 304.

[5] *French Portraits*, p. 103.

A study of the origins of the Symbolist movement and interviews with its most prominent survivors have convinced me that there is no serious foundation for these assertions; on this point I am in complete accord with Mr F. S. Flint's opinion, expressed in the *Poetry Review* (August, 1912): 'It has been said that the introduction of *vers libre* was due to the influence of Walt Whitman and of German poetry. I agree with M. Florian-Parmentier that in the question of purely French technique, the names of foreign poets cannot be invoked[1].'

In the first place, the idea of Whitman's influence having acted on the *vers libre*, put forward in *Poètes d'Aujourd'hui*, was explained away in an interview with the joint compiler of the anthology. A contemporary of the whole movement and a scholar of repute, M. Van Bever ridiculed the notion as soon as it was mentioned, and was consequently astonished when shown the passage in question. Jocularly pointing out a 'peut-être' in the paragraph, he professed ignorance of its existence and confessed that, though he was responsible for the notices prefixed to the selections in the anthology, it was his colleague, M. Paul Léautaud, who had given them their final form, from notes furnished by him.

The other statements already quoted appear, on closer examination, to be no less unsubstantial. At best they are but isolated assertions unsupported by any explanation or proof. M. Remy de Gourmont himself referred me to M. Vielé-Griffin as most likely to furnish the true solution of the question.

As has been said, the *vers libre* virtually dates from the publication of M. Gustave Kahn's *Palais nomades* (1887). But if the discovery of the desired medium is due to M. Kahn, equal credit must be given to M. Francis Vielé-Griffin for establishing on a firm and recognised basis the new versification to which his life-work is an important contribution. Moreover, he and Laforgue[2], who shares with M. Kahn the honour of being the originator of *verslibrisme*, were the first translators of

[1] See article on 'Contemporary French Poetry,' p. 358. In the same article Mr Flint speaks of M. Tancrède de Visan as the 'theorist of Symbolisme.' In answer to an inquiry about the passage already quoted, M. de Visan made the following interesting reply: 'Le passage auquel vous faites allusion des *Poètes d'aujourd'hui* me semble absolument faux. La vérité est que le Symbolisme comme toute école, après coup, s'est cherché des ancêtres ou des maîtres. Il a déclaré qu'il avait puisé dans la lecture de Whitman l'idée du vers libre, alors que le poète américain n'a pas été connu en France—ou presque—avant 1895. Jules Laforgue, Gustave Kahn, Moréas, ont fait du vers libre sans connaître Whitman. Seul Vielé-Griffin, peut-être, a pu emprunter à l'auteur des *Brins d'herbe* quelques rythmes polymorphes. Pour ma part je crois que le vers libre français ne doit rien ou presque rien à l'étranger. Il fut chez nous une création spontanée et s'il faut lui trouver des ancêtres, c'est plutôt dans nos chansons du Moyen Age qu'on les puiserait.'

[2] To M. Griffin Laforgue owed his acquaintance with *Leaves of Grass*.

Whitman into French[1]. Probably both were interested as much in the robust originality of Whitman's thought as in the novelty of his form. *Les Joies*, M. Vielé-Griffin's first volume of free verse, came out in 1889. Three years later he writes of the form 'ô absolument libre, du poète des *Brins d'herbe*[2].' In 1896 a French writer hails M. Vielé-Griffin as 'le petit-fils de Walt-Whitman[3]';—though it is hard to conceive that any idea of such indebtedness as these words imply could survive a comparison of the works of the two poets. M. Vielé-Griffin himself not only denies any debt to Whitman, but rejects the suggestion that Whitman had any influence whatever on the origin of French free verse, which, he maintains, was a native development, having its true source in the *vers libéré* of Verlaine. Until lately, he says, Whitman has had no influence on poets of the French tongue except perhaps on MM. Maeterlinck and Paul Claudel. The case of M. Maeterlinck will be considered further on. With respect to M. Claudel, although Whitman's influence is frequently invoked to explain a singular similarity of form, it may be said here that the French poet considers his verse a personal creation, the outcome of years of experiment.

As for Jules Laforgue, he read and translated Whitman whom he introduced to the readers of *La Vogue* as 'l'étonnant poète américain.' But his own poetry—one of intellectual subtleties and refined ironical sentiment—shows no trace of Whitman's virile thought, vast outlook and multitudinous sympathies. Laforgue's verse was, at first, free only in the sense that Verlaine's is: both poets excelled in playing skilful and daring variations on the old metrical themes. But at a certain period in his career, Laforgue took to writing *vers libre*. His acquaintance with M. Kahn's metrical theories has been mentioned in connexion with this change; but it has never, apparently, been associated with his introduction to Whitman's poetry. I am inclined to regard this also as a case of personal development, and some support for this view will be found in Laforgue's private notes[4], which go to prove his quest for a highly individualistic medium of expression[5]. There is no good reason, later, for agreeing with M. F. Strowski when he writes of

[1] Casual renderings of Whitman's verse were made in French articles on the American poet as early as 1878; but these are negligible as translations.

[2] In *Entretiens politiques et littéraires*, Avril, 1892: *Autobiographie de Walt Whitman.*

[3] Maurice le Blond, *Essai sur la Naturisme* (1896).

[4] *Entretiens politiques et littéraires*, 2ième année, vol. III, no. 18.

[5] What he was aiming at at this time (1885—1886) seems to have been the prose poem, though as early as 1886 he published a poem in *vers libre* (*À une défunte*) in *L'Indépendante* (Nouvelle série, vol. I, no. 1). His first translation from Whitman appeared in the tenth number of *La Vogue*, dated June 25 to July 5, 1886.

Laforgue as having 'appris de l'Américain, Walt Whitman, ce qu'une oreille naturellement musicale avait enseigné à Marie Krysinska[1].'

In short, had not fragments of Whitman's poetry been translated about the time when the first *vers libres* were being written, probably no attempt would have been made to forge a link connecting the two phenomena. That the amorphous rhapsodies of the American are much more unbridled than the freest French verses of that time is unconsciously demonstrated in the pages of the *Revue Indépendante* for 1888, where some of the earliest *vers libres* are printed side by side with renderings of *Leaves of Grass*. The best argument against the theory that the *vers libre* derives from Whitman is advanced by Mr Jethro Bithell and supported by all French authorities. Although translations from Whitman during the *vers libre* period were fairly numerous 'they had not attracted the least notice and no one betrayed the slightest interest for the technique of the American poet. As a matter of fact few people knew anything about Whitman beside the two poets of American birth, Francis Vielé-Griffin and Stuart Merrill; and both at that time, although of course their manner was new, were writing as far as *form* is concerned, regular verse[2].'

Mr Bithell then points out the connexion between Whitman and the Belgian poets; and this brings us to the first definite case of Whitman's influence on French literature: 'Another of the first poets to write free verse, the Walloon poet, Albert Mockel, was not unacquainted with Whitman: he had read *American Poems*, selected by William M. Rossetti. Now Mockel, as editor of *La Wallonie*, which he had founded to defend the new style, was connected with the whole group of symbolists and "verslibristes," all of whom, practically, were regular contributors to the review....But as it happened, Mockel was not in the least inspired by the selections from Whitman in Rossetti's collection; they made the impression on him of being Bible verses rather than real verses. *One poet Whitman's lawless line did directly influence; and this was Maeterlinck whose rhymeless verses in "Serres Chaudes" were written under the inspiration of "Leaves of Grass."* But *Serres Chaudes* did not appear till 1889 and even then the majority of the poems in the volume were rhymed and regular; so that it could hardly be claimed that Maeterlinck was the originator of the vers libre.'

An examination of certain poems in *Serres Chaudes* will show the nature of the influence. Most of the poems in this volume are in

[1] *Littérature française du XIX^e siècle*, p. 458.
[2] J. Bithell, *Maurice Maeterlinck*, p. 15.

octosyllabic quatrains. But, interspersed, are seven pieces without rhyme or any appreciable rhythm. In this they are at once ahead of the freest *vers libres* of that day, and abreast of Whitman's emancipated lines, to which they bear a more striking resemblance. Whitman's mode of writing has been dubbed the 'catalogue style.' .Frequently a series of sketches are penned in rapid succession so as to drive home the full force of an idea or impart the peculiar flavour or *nuance* of an emotion by means of a long string of minutely appropriate images. This method is discernible in the 'free' poems of *Serres Chaudes* where it is employed for still subtler purposes. In these poems, M. Maeterlinck attempts to arrest the flight of a transitory fancy, to communicate an indescribable *état d'âme*, to give the suggestion of the purely abstract or abstruse, by a series of concrete symbols[1]. The result is an abundance, if not an excess, of enumeration and ejaculations such as we find elsewhere only in Whitman; so that certain poems of both writers present the singular appearance of an unusual number of consecutive lines beginning with the same words and ending with notes of exclamation. The most striking example of M. Maeterlinck's use of these devices, pre-eminently characteristic of Whitman, occurs in the poem entitled *Regards*[2], which, curiously enough, M. Tancrède de Visan enthrones as the true type of the Symbolist method of poetic expression.

O ces regards pauvres et las !
Et les vôtres et les miens !
Et ceux qui ne sont plus et ceux qui vont venir !
Et ceux qui n'arriveront jamais et qui existent cependant !
Il y en a qui semblent visiter des pauvres un dimanche ;
Il y en a comme des malades sans maison ;
Il y en a comme des agneaux dans une prairie couverte de linges.
Et ces regardes insolites !
Il y en a sous la voûte desquels on assiste à l'exécution d'une vierge dans une salle close,
Et ceux qui font songer à des tristesses ignorées !
A des paysans aux fenêtres de l'usine,
A un jardinier devenu tisserand,
A une après-midi d'été dans un musée de cires,
Aux idées d'une reine qui regarde un malade dans le jardin,
A une odeur de camphre dans la forêt,
A enfermer une princesse dans une tour, un jour de fête,
A naviguer toute une semaine sur un canal tiède.

Ayez pitié de ceux qui sortent à petits pas comme des convalescents dans la moisson !
Ayez pitié de ceux qui ont l'air d'enfants égarés à l'heure du repas !

[1] 'Nous le voyons dans les *Serres Chaudes* entasser à dessein les images pour mieux nous faire pénétrer son impression subtile' (T. de Visan, *L'Attitude du lyrisme contemporain*, p. 120).
[2] *Serres Chaudes*, p. 71.

Ayez pitié des regards du blessé vers le chirurgien !
Pareils à des tentes sous l'orage !
Ayez pitié des regards de la vierge tentée !
(Oh ! des fleuves de lait vont fuir dans les ténèbres !
Et les cygnes sont morts au milieu des serpents !)
Et de ceux de la vierge qui succombe !
Princesses abandonnées en des marécages sans issues !
Et ces yeux où s'éloignent à pleines voiles de navires illuminés dans la tempête !
Et le pitoyable de tous ces regards qui souffrent de n'être pas ailleurs !
Et tant de souffrances presque indistinctes et si diverses cependant !
Et ceux que nul ne comprendra jamais !
Et ceux pauvres regards presque muets !
Et ces pauvres regards qui chuchotent !
Et ces pauvres regards étouffés !...

With this may be compared almost any of the longer poems from *Leaves of Grass*, particularly—for its initial repetitions and ejaculations—*Salut au Monde!*[1] But perhaps nothing Whitman has written resembles the above poem more closely in idea and expression than the composition entitled *Faces*.

Sauntering the pavement or riding the country by-road, lo such faces !
Faces of friendship, precision, caution, suavity, ideality,
The spiritual-prescient face, the always welcome common benevolent face,
The face of the singing of music, the grand faces of natural lawyers and judges, broad at the back-top,
The faces of hunters and fishers bulged at the brows, the shaved blanch'd faces of orthodox citizens,
The pure extravagant, yearning, questioning artist's face,
The ugly face of some beautiful soul, the handsome detested or despised face,
The sacred faces of infants, the illuminated face of the mother of many children,
The face of an amour, the face of veneration,
The faces of a dream, the face of an immobile rock,
The face withdrawn of its good and bad, a castrated face,
A wild hawk, his wings clipp'd by the clipper,
A stallion that yielded at last to the thongs and knife of the gelder.
Sauntering the pavements thus, or crossing the ceaseless ferry, faces and faces and faces....

These two quotations illustrate the sole case we have found of Whitman's influence on the Symbolists. M. Bazalgette's complete translation of *Leaves of Grass* has, since 1909, given an impetus to the study and influence of Whitman in France. But it is beyond my present purpose to trace the Whitman strain through the devious ramifications of contemporary French poetry. I must be content with a retrospective glance at the general position.

The *vers libre* is an emancipated form of versification relying for its effects on subtler harmonies and concordances than those of regular

[1] In this poem of 226 lines, 83 begin with the words 'I see,' 39 with 'You,' 18 with I hear.'

verse. While it usually employs rhythm and rhyme or assonance, it avoids anything like a metrical scheme of balanced verses and identical stanzas. Its principles are now acknowledged as innate in French versification from the earliest times; but as a fully recognised form of lyrical expression, it dates only from the later eighties, when a natural reaction set in against the limitations imposed upon verse by the bronze and marble ideals of Parnassian prosody. Some of the more revolutionary poets felt that the intricacies and niceties of modern thought and feeling could not be adequately expressed by any pre-arranged system of rigid metres; but required a medium as unrestricted and varied as the succession of fugitive ideas and emotions themselves. In an age characterized by the interpenetration and coordination of the arts, the new poets made music not sculpture their extra-literary model; and consequently set about adapting old forms and inventing others to suit their purpose. So far, the movement was of purely French origin. Its development, however, may have been moulded to some slight extent by extraneous influence. A knowledge of foreign poetry was undoubtedly possessed by many of the innovators, and, possibly, models were sought in literatures where less rigorous versifications prevail. Such models would not only guide the innovator, but, in a way, legitimatize his venture. He would feel a certain moral support in claiming kinship with another who had successfully accomplished something similar to what he himself was aiming at. Moreover, this would furnish a strong argument against the critics at home. He might even fall into the error of attaching an exaggerated importance to his foreign master. In this way not a few poets have gained abroad reputations disproportionate to their importance in their native literature. Edgar Allen Poe and Whitman have not escaped this sort of literary lionizing in France.

Undoubtedly the greater part of French free verse has been a spontaneous production, uninfluenced by foreign examples. But of all extraneous influences that of Whitman has been most frequently suggested. It happened that he himself was in a somewhat similar position to that of the early *verslibristes*. He, too, had adopted a novel and personal form, unfettered by rhyme or metre; he too was suffering for the uncompromising boldness of his innovation at the hands of disconcerted critics reared in the old school. By 1877, the date of the publication of M. Kahn's first volume of *vers libres*, Whitman had already accomplished about twenty-two years' work. *Leaves of Grass* was in its sixth edition. Young French poets, struggling to attain

a personal medium, would naturally be interested in hearing of one who was winning in just such a campaign as their own. From America, where Whitman was slowly gaining recognition, had come MM. Stuart Merrill and Francis Vielé-Griffin. Both these poets were interested in, though not influenced by, their compatriot's experiment in verse-writing. Both can now claim a place in the forefront of the Symbolist movement, and their influence must have been considerable. We have seen something of what M. Vielé-Griffin did to make Whitman known in France. Since their early efforts, Whitman's reputation has grown in that country, till it can boast a complete translation of his poetry and a deep enthusiasm for Whitman as a poet of the people which is bearing fruit in 'new' poetry of a more generous and democratic appeal.

Yet we must be careful not to exaggerate Whitman's importance in France at too early a date. Perhaps it would be safest to say that in the days when the first *vers libres* were being written[1], the poets who knew Whitman—and they were few, though important—were attracted mainly through the appeal made by his brusque originality to their pronounced taste for literary novelties. They may even have regarded him as a foreign master who had accomplished a revolution in poetical art similar to that which they were attempting, but never as a magician who would initiate them into the mysteries of some startling metrical innovation.

P. M. Jones.

Oxford.

[1] M. Maeterlinck's case need not be considered here. He probably came across Whitman more or less by chance, while exploring the wide field of foreign literatures. But his imitations of Whitman appeared when the *vers libre* movement was well started and do not seem to have inspired subsequent imitators.

LETTRES INÉDITES DE GAETANO POLIDORI ET DE CHATEAUBRIAND.

Les lettres publiées ci-dessous se trouvent dans l'exemplaire des *Œuvres de Chateaubriand* donné par James Morris à la bibliothèque de University College, London. Elles sont contenues dans un cahier de 8 feuillets collé en tête du Vol. I de ces *Œuvres* et qui comprend d'abord la lettre de Gaetano Polidori annonçant à Chateaubriand l'envoi de son *Paradiso Perduto* et ensuite la copie de la réponse de Chateaubriand. Nous avons ici évidemment le brouillon autographe de la lettre adressée à Chateaubriand et la copie faite par Gaetano Polidori de l'accusé de réception de l'' Illustrissimo Visconte.' L'écriture de ces deux lettres est bien de la main même de Gaetano Polidori, comme nous avons pu nous en convaincre en examinant le fac-similé de sa signature, au bas du portrait publié dans *Il Losario*, entre la page 176 et la page 177, et les additions autographes qui se trouvent à la suite de la liste d'errata dans l'exemplaire de cet ouvrage donné par Gaetano Polidori au Musée Britannique[1]. Le brouillon est très soigné; le texte de la lettre est précédé d'un feuillet où se trouvent le titre suivant: *Lettera di Gaetano Polidori al Visconte di Chateaubriand intorno alle loro traduzioni del Paradiso Perduto* et au-dessous un paraphe à fioritures; l'écriture est très appliquée surtout dans les 10 premières pages; les pages sont numérotées de 1–12, les feuillets servant de couverture ne portent pas de numéros. Dans le brouillon il y a un renvoi (cf. p. 202, n. 6) qui certainement n'a pas été mis dans la lettre même envoyée à Chateaubriand. Par contre il y manque plusieurs signes de ponctuation; quelques rares mots qui auraient dû être soulignés ne le sont pas; et l'on trouve aussi une faute d'étourderie (cf. p. 197, n. 4) en italien et plusieurs

[1] Au bas du portrait on trouve en fac-similé: ' Gaetano Polidori nato nel castello di Bientina in Toscana.' La dédicace est sur feuille de papier à lettre volante; elle est ainsi conçue: ' Alla Celeberrima Libreria del Museo Britannico.' C'est un miracle que cette feuille ne se soit pas perdue. On ferait bien au Musée Britannique de coller ces dédicaces sur feuilles volantes. Elles peuvent s'égarer facilement et puis même dans le Paradis de Great Russell Street ' opportunity makes the thief.'

fautes d'anglais et de français[1]. Quant aux quelques lignes de Chateaubriand, elles sont précédées de ces mots: *Copia della Risposta*; cette réponse a, comme nous l'avons dit, été copiée par Gaetano Polidori lui-même et, en la publiant, nous avons respecté l'orthographe même que nous avons trouvée dans la copie.

La publication de la lettre de Chateaubriand aura un certain intérêt d'actualité puis qu'on s'occupe en ce moment de recueillir toutes les lettres de l'illustre écrivain français; elle pourra aussi avoir un certain intérêt de curiosité puisque dans ces dernières années on a examiné de près sa traduction du *Paradise Lost* en quelques articles piquants quand ce ne serait que par la diversité des jugements que portent leurs auteurs[2].

Quant à la lettre de Gaetano Polidori elle contribuera peut-être à faire relire sa traduction qui n'est pas dépourvue de valeur; elle montrera en tout cas qu'il n'a épargné aucune peine pour résoudre quelques-unes des difficultés posées par le texte de Milton. Elle attirera peut-être aussi l'attention sur le père de John William Polidori. Gaetano Polidori ne fut pas sans mérite; outre qu'il fut un professeur d'italien renommé, on lui doit quelques écrits qui ne sont pas à dédaigner. Je ne parle pas de ses ouvrages scolaires, ni non plus des contes qu'il avait publiés en 1798, après avoir été appelé par les dames Ogg et Robinson à enseigner l'italien dans leur école de Queen's Square, célèbre à la fin du XVIII[e] siècle[3]; mais je penserais plutôt à ses traductions de Milton, de Lucain (*Della Farsaglia*, 1841) et des *Ἀποφθεγματα Βασιλεων* (*Scelta d' Apoftegmi d' uomini illustri di Plutarco*, 1804); à ses œuvres poétiques originales où, à défaut de poésie, on trouve parfois des passages bien venus et un grand talent de versificateur, comme on pourra s'en convaincre en parcourant ses *Poesie Varie*,

[1] Dans l'édition ci-dessous nous avons corrigé ces fautes dans le texte et rejeté les fautes de l'original en note. Comme il s'agit d'un brouillon, nous n'avons pas jugé nécessaire d'indiquer les fins de ligne, ni les signes de ponctuation que nous ajoutons ni les mots que nous mettons en italiques et qui ne sont pas soulignés dans le texte. Il n'y en a d'ailleurs que fort peu, trois ou quatre au plus, que l'auteur ait négligé de souligner.

[2] Cf. notamment *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*: E. Dick, *La traduction du 'Paradis Perdu' de Milton* (1910, pp. 750—767); *Sur Chateaubriand, traducteur de Milton* (1911, pp. 158–9), où M. V. Giraud publie une lettre de ce fin poète et de cet excellent anglicisant qu'était Auguste Angellier; F. Boillot, *Chateaubriand théoricien de la traduction* (1912, pp. 791—801).

[3] Cf. *Saggio de Novelle e Favole*, la lettre-préface qu'il adresse *Alle molte Illustri Signore, Le Signore Ogg & Robinson*, et notamment le passage où il précise le but de cet opuscule qui était: 'd' istruire nella lingua italiana e dare ad un tempo degli esempi di premiata virtù e punito vizio da' quali possa la giuventù esser condotta a quella morale, da cui in gran parte dipende la felicità della vita ed intieramente la tranquillità dello spirito.'

les trois derniers chants de *Il Losario*[1] et quelques actes de ses drames et tragédies[2]; enfin à quelques-unes de ses remarques critiques comme celles qui se trouvent à la suite de l'*Angeleida*[3].

(p. 1) Al Visconte di Chateaubriand,

Illustrissimo Signore,

Le mando le mie versioni delle Opere poetiche di Milton, sperando ch' ella mi farà l' onore d' accettarle e d' accordar loro un posto nella sua Libreria.

Quello ch' ella potrà leggere nella prefazione del terzo tomo intorno alla sua traduzione del *Paradiso perduto* lo scrissi prima d' aver letto poco più che le sue preliminari osservazioni, ma appena fui libero del tedio di rivedere il mio manoscritto e le prove del mio lavoro, lessi tutta la pregevole opera sua col principale scopo di vedere se andavamo d' accordo nell' interpetrazione, ed ho visto con mio sommo piacere che abbiamo interpetrato il nostro originale, eccettuatine alcuni pochissimi passi, nella medesima maniera.

Nel leggere, mi è occorso di fare alcune osservazioni le quali porrò sotto ai suoi occhi sagaci. Ella ne farà quel conto che il suo giudizio le detterà. D' alcuni pochi e piccioli sbagli che sono nella sua prima edizione (1836) non occorre far menzione, poichè credo che gli avrà corretti nella[4] seconda. Noterò dunque alcune poche cose di maggior momento; e se ella avesse la pazienza di leggere la mia traduzione, accennarmene qualche sbaglio e dirmene il suo sentimento, le ne sarei infinitamente obbligato, essendo io sicuro che non vi ha persona più capace di lei di pronunziarne sentenza.

[1] Cf. *Poesie Varie* (Londra, 1805?) et *Il Losario*, poema eroico-romanzesco di Ser Francesco Polidori, il quale essendo restato incompleto per prematura morte dell' autore è stato ridotto a fine coll' aggiunta di tre canti da Gaetano Polidori suo nipote, Firenze, tipografia Le Monnier, 1851.

[2] *Tragedie e drammi* di Gaetano Polidori, Londra, 1842. Les tragédies, *Isabella*, *Gernando*, *Leonora*, les drames sacrés *Figluol prodigo*, *Nabucodonosorre*, et la tragicomédie romanesque *Olimpia* que contient ce recueil n'ont probablement jamais été joués en Italie. Dans sa préface l'auteur nous dit: 'Non essendo tornato in Italia dacch' io ne partii nel 1785, non ho potuto sapere se alcuno di questi drammi avrebbe potuto indurre qualche impresario di teatro a porlo in scena, pure crederei che qualcuno di essi non dovesse dispiacere agli spettatori se fosse rappresentato.'

[3] *L' Angeleida*, poema del Signor Erasmo de Valvasone all' Illustrissimo Principe Pasquale Cicogna ed all' Illustrissima Signoria di Venezia ristampato secondo la rarissima ediz[ione] del MDXC per servire d' appendice al Paradiso Perduto di Milton Tradotto da G. Polidori, Londra, 1842, Presso l' editore 15 Park Village East.

En tête de cette édition qui sert de complément à la traduction de G. Polidori se trouvent: 1° Notizie intorno al poema dell' Angeleida ed all' autore di esso (pp. iii—iv); 2° Discorso di Gaetano Polidori intorno all' imitazione e confronto dell' Angeleida col Paradiso Perduto (pp. v—xviii); Lettera dell' Autore al Clarissimo ed Observandissimo Signor Lorenzo Massa meritissimo segretario della repubblica di Venezia (pp. xix—xxx).

[4] *MS.* nelle.

(p. 2) Nel primo libro ove Milton dice 'Of Oreb or of Sinai,' ella ha tradotto 'D'Oreb *et* du Sinai.'—Se l' Oreb ed il Sinai sono l' istessa cosa, come ci vien detto dai commentatori, Milton non volle altro mostrare che il dubbio se dovesse dargli l' uno o l' altro nome; e se si vuole che questi siano due differenti monti, noi sappiamo che Mosè fu inspirato sopra uno di essi soltanto, e non sopra l' uno e sopra l' altro.

Ella ha poi tradotto quel passo 'Or with linked thunderbolts transfix us to the bottom of this gulf,' 'ou nous attacher à coups de foudre au fond de cet abîme.' Parmi che quel *linked* l' abbia imbarazzata come imbarazzò pur me mentre traduceva, poichè non poteva entrare nel mio intelletto, nè anche poeticamente, come si potesse formare una catena di fulmini, nè vedeva con qual figura od allusione si potesse giustificare quella strana maniera di dire, pure, pensando alla fine che *linked* potesse avere l' istesso significato che *chained* del quarto libro ove ella ha tradotto 'tonnerres ramés' tradussi così:

Di questo golfo al fondo
Fulminee saette incatenate
Ci trafiggan?

e dissi piuttosto *fulminee saette*, che *tuoni o folgori incatenati*, profittando dell' errore non meno popolare che antico, che il fulmine lasci dietro a sè una pietra o che altro si sia, (materiale al certo) poichè si poteva seppellire, e che viene espressa da Lucano nella Farsaglia per *fulminis ignes*, ove si dice da Arunte

Dispersos fulminis ignes
Colligit et terrae maesto cum murmure condit.

(p. 3) Mi accorgo però adesso che la mia stessa interpetrazione, rigorosamente parlando, non è la vera, e che si deve intendere d' un numero di tuoni o folgori scagliati così rapidamente che l' uno non aspetta l' altro.

'Ambrosial odors and ambrosial flowers' (lib. 2°) ella l' ha tradotto così 'parfums[1] d'ambroisie et fleurs d'ambroisie'; ma l' ambrosia secondo Dioscoride ed altri semplicisti, non produce fiore, ma soltanto certi racemoli che ne contengono il seme. Io ho creduto che 'ambrosial odors and ambrosial flowers' fosse l' istesso che il dire 'odors and flowers ambrosial,' riferendo l' aggettivo ad ambi i sostantivi, ed ho tradotto:

E di profumi e fiori al par soavi
Che l' ambrosia.

[1] *MS.* parfume.

In questo medesimo libro ho osato d' interpetrare *unmoved* in senso differente da quello che ci vien suggerito dal Dr Newton nella nota in cui dice: 'unmoved with any of those dangers which deterred others.' Ella ha seguito questa interpetrazione, ed avrà molti che sosterranno che sia la vera. A me è parso evidente che quì *unmoved* si debba interpetrare non in senso morale, ma in senso fisico. Osservi quello che precede:

> At last
> Satan, whom now *transcendent glory* rais'd
> Above his fellows, WITH TRANSCENDENT PRIDE,
> *Conscious of his highest worth*, unmoved thus spake.

Spoke from the throne direbbero adesso gl' inglesi. Ch' egli non si alzasse prima d' aver parlato, risulta ben chiaramente alla fine del suo discorso ove è (p. 4) detto; 'Thus saying, rose the monarch.' Io dunque ho osato tradurre così:

> Satanno al fine
> La cui gloria eminente, sopra ogni altro
> Inalzato lo avea, con regal fasto
> Sendogli noto il superior suo merto,
> Senza sorger dal seggio, così disse.

Sembrami che così il contesto regga ad ogni scrutinio, mentre, nell' altra maniera, non parmi che possa rigorosamente reggere, poichè 'transcendent glory' &c., non hanno alcuno correlazione con *dangers & deterred.*

Ho evitato quell' assurdità che nasce nelle traduzioni francesi ed italiane dall' essere in inglese *Sin* di genere femminino, e *Death* di genere mascolino, mentre, al contrario, si dice LA *mort et* LE *péché* in francese, e LA *morte ed* IL *peccato* in italiano, onde nelle traduzioni in queste due lingue si trova che dalla testa di Satanasso nasce IL Peccato il quale è ingravidato dal padre; e dal Peccato nasce LA Morte la quale ingravida LUI dal quale ELLA è nata. Per evitare queste mostruosità ho chiamato il Peccato *Colpa*, e non essendovi nella lingua italiana un nome di genere mascolino che significhi *morte*, mi son servito d' un latinismo e gli ho posto nome *Leto*, lo che ho creduto poter fare convenientemente, avendo noi l' aggettivo *letale* che significa mortale[1].

Quando Milton parla degli embrioni degli atomi che prendon parte in favore dei venti nella loro lotta, ella ha tradotto bene 'poise their lighter wings,' 'pour servir de lest à leurs ailes légères': io male, non

[1] Cf. préface de Polidori, *Paradiso Perduto*, p. xvi, où il avait déjà exprimé la même idée: 'Varie altre allegorie s' incontrano in questo poema e tra esse quella del Peccato personificato in una mostruosa donna, e della Morte rappresentata in un maschio fantasma, onde, per mantenere il genere dell' uno e dell' altra, abbiam chiamato *Colpa* il *Peccato* e con voce desunta dal Latino abbiam posto nome *Leto* alla Morte.'

avendo detto se non *librano i lor vanni.* Suppongo che nella sua nuova edizione in cambio di *légères,* abbia detto *plus légères,* chè così dice (p. 5) l' originale.

Alla fine del IV. libro, là dove dice: 'since thine strength[1] no more than heaven permits, nor mine though doubled now to trample thee as mire,' ella ha tradotto così: 'Puisque ni ta force ni la mienne ne sont que ce que permet le ciel, quoique la mienne soit à présent doublée *à fin* que je te foule aux pieds comme la fange.'—Quell' *à fin* non mi sembra che ci quadri, poichè non era quello il fine al quale si tendeva, ma solamente a far sì che Satanasso partisse senza combattere. Io ho interpetrato questo passo in differente maniera, prendendo il *though doubled* in senso ellittico, come se volesse significare 'though mine were doubled' ed ho tradotto:

Poichè nè la tua forza nè la mia
È maggiore di quel che il ciel permette,
Foss' ella il doppio ancor, sì ch' io potessi
Te calpestar nel fango.

La sua interpetrazione si può giustificare coll' attribuire il raddoppiamento della forza di Gabriele all' aver egli veduto saltar in aria il peso della pugna posto in bilancia contro quello della partenza; e la mia dal poter esser raddoppiata per angeli che potevano a lui esser mandati dal cielo.

In quel passo del VII. libro v. 28 &c.

Yet not alone, while thou
Visit'st my slumbers nightly, or when morn
Purples the east,

parmi che quel *while* debba avere il significato di *poichè*: traducendolo per *mentre* o *lors que,* ne nasce un senso vero sì, ma triviale: io dunque ho tradotto così:

Ma non sono
Solo però, *poichè* notturna vieni
Tu a visitarmi, allor che nel sopore
Immerso io sono, o allora che il mattino
Di porpora riveste l' oriente.

(p. 6) Ella ha detto: 'Cependant je ne suis pas seul lors que la nuit tu visites[2] mes sommeils' &c.

Là dove Milton, parlando degli uccelli, dice:

Part more wise,
In common, rang'd in figure, wedge their way,
Intelligent of seasons and set forth
Their airy caravan, high over seas
Flying and over lands, with mutual wing
Easing their flight.

[1] *MS.* strenght. [2] *MS.* visite.

Ella ha tradotto questo passo così: 'D'autres plus sages, formant une figure, tracent un chemin en commun: intelligens des saisons, ils font partir leurs caravanes aériennes qui volent au-dessus des terres et des mers, et d'une aile mutuelle facilitent leur fuite.'

Quantunque io non abbia trovato il verbo *to wedge* che nel senso di frapporre zeppe tra' lati d' un corpo e l' altro, pure ho creduto che Milton abbia quì fatto uso di questo verbo in un senso particolare, e che per *wedge their way* abbia voluto significare *volano in forma di zeppa* o per dirlo meno volgarmente *in forma conica* od *in forma d' angolo acuto*, che questo corrisponde alla descrizione che si fa del volo delle grue da Aristotile ed è ripetuto da Cicerone, *trianguli efficere formam*; e Du Bartas dice:

J'enten crier la grue
Qui ja desja voudroit escrire dans la nue
Le fourchu charactere. (*Jour* v.)

Ed è ripetuto più esattamente nello *Spectacolo della Natura* (p. 7) ove si dice: 'ils s'arrangent ordinairement sur une longue colonne comme un I ou sur deux lignes réunies en un point comme un V renversé.' (*Eut.* XI.) Io dunque ho tradotto così:

Altri più saggi, del volar presagi
Delle stagioni, uniti ivano in forma
D' angolo acuto, alla cui punta or questo
A vicenda, ed or quel battea le penne
Alto sopra del mare e della terra
Lor vol facilitando.

Al principio del X. libro, quell' oscuro passo: 'From his secret cloud, amidst in thunder utter'd thus his voice,' ove la virgola parmi che dovrebbe esser posta, non dopo *cloud*, ma dopo *amidst*, e che si debba costruire così: 'From amidst his secret cloud, utter'd thus his voice in thunder.' La traduzion letterale mi sembra che ritenga l' oscurità stessa dell' originale: 'Du fond de son secret nuage, il fit sortir sa voix dans le tonnerre': io non so se mi appongo al vero o no, ma parmi che il senso sia questo:

Dalla chiusa nube
L' altissimo ed eterno Padre, questi
Detti udir fece con tonante voce.

Alla pagina 117 del secondo tomo della mia traduzione tra l' ultimo ed il penultimo verso n' è stato omesso uno. Deve dire così:

Si vedeva la colpa e la vergogna,
Il turbamento, la disperazione,
L' ira, l' ostinazion, l' odio e la frode.

Ecco un altro passo oscuro la cui letteral traduzione non può esser meno oscura dell' originale:

(p. 8)
Eve, thy contempt of life and pleasure, seems
To argue in thee something more sublime
And excellent than that thy mind contemns;
But self-destruction[1], therefore sought, refutes
That excellent thought in thee; and implies,
Not thy contempt, but anguish and regret
For loss of life and pleasure overlov'd.

Ecco la sua traduzione: 'Eve, ton mépris de la vie et du plaisir semble prouver en toi quelque chose de plus sublime et de plus excellent que ce que ton âme dédaigne, mais la destruction de soi-même par cela qu'elle est recherchée, détruit l'idée de cette excellence supposée et implique[2], non ton mépris, mais ton angoisse et ton regret de la perte de la vie et du plaisir trop aimé.' Io, tenendomi all' originale quanto ho potuto, ma spendendovi quella chiarezza che in esso manca, ho tradotto così:

Spregiar vita e piacer, parmi che mostri
Non so che di più eccelso ed eccellente
Che quel non è che l' alma tua dispregia;
Ma l' eccellenza ch' al primiero aspetto
Si mostra, dissipata è dal pensiero
Di distrugger se stesso, che non mostra
Disprezzo del piacere e della vita,
Ma rammarico troppo e troppa ambascia
Del perduto diletto.

E se non è questo quello che Milton volle dire, parmi almeno che sia tale da non dovere avergli fatto vergogna se l' avesse detto, poich' è fondato sulla verità.

Vengo adesso a quei due passi menzionati da lei nelle sue osserva-
(p. 9) zioni preliminari. Il primo è quello del VIII. libro ove dice:

With goddes-like[3] demeanour, forth she went
Not unattended, for on her as queen,
A pomp of winning[4] graces waited still,
And from about her shot darts of desire
Into[5] all eyes, to wish her still in sight.

Mi accordo con lei a dire che *c'est du jargon*, ma qual nazione non fu un tempo infettata di questo *jargon*? In Francia pur anche mentre il più perfetto critico del Parnasso francese, Boileau, teneva in briglia il pegaseo cavallo, si udiva recitar sul teatro 'Brûlée de plus de feux que je n'en allumai[6]. La moitié de ma vie a mis l'autre au tombeau' &c., &c.; e questo passo è reso anche peggiore perchè è la ripetizione d' un'

[1] *MS.* distruction. [2] *MS.* emplique. [3] *sic.*
[4] *MS.* waiting. [5] *MS.* Unto.
[6] *L'auteur ajoute au bas de la page* 9 *en renvoi à ce vers:* 'Ho detto questo perchè Mr De Chateaubriand lo chiama *antien gargon italien* (*sic*).'

idea che ha espresso pochi versi sopra, ove si dice che partì con tal grazia 'that won who saw to wish her stay,' e quì 'About her shot darts of desire unto all eyes to wish her still in sight.' Ella ha tradotto questo passo così: 'Eve s'éloigna avec la démarche d'une déesse: elle n'étoit pas sans suite, car près d'elle comme une reine, un cortège de grâces attrayantes se tient toujours[1]; et d'autour d'elle jaillissoient dans tous les yeux des traits de désir qui fesoit[2] souhetter encore sa présence.' Ed io:

A lei dintorno
Facean le Grazie splendida corona
Ad ossequiarla, strali saettando
Di desiderio in chi la rimirava,
Ch' ella non si celasse ai loro sguardi.

(p. 10) L' altro passo è quello del libro IX ove Satanasso nel serpente dice ad Eva:

God[3] can not hurt ye and be just;
And not just, not God; not fear'd[4] then not obey'd;
Your fear itself of death removes the fear.

È questo una specie di sillogismo veramente diabolico, tanto per l' intelligenza quanto pel significato; ella ha tradotto letteralmente: 'Dieu ne peut vous frapper et être juste; s'il n'est pas juste, il n'est pas Dieu, il ne faut alors ni le craindre[5], ni lui obéir: votre crainte[6] elle-même écarte la crainte[6] de la mort.'—La mia traduzione è più chiara:

Voi punir non puote
Dio senz' essere ingiusto, e ingiusto essendo
Dio non sarebbe, e quindi nè temere
Nè obbedir si dovria. Bandir dovete
Dunque il timore della morte, come
Dalla giustizia del Supremo aliena.

Mi era scordato d' osservare che nel X. libro v. 312[7] dove si dice:

Now that they brought the work by wondrous art
Pontifical,

ella ha omesso questo misterioso aggettivo intorno al quale si dice in una nota che Spenser era stato biasimato per aver fatto uso della voce *munificence* in senso di difesa o fortificazione, dal latino *munio* e *facio*, e che Milton è ancor più biasimevole per aver fatto uso di *pontifical* che si può interpetrare in senso ambiguo, cioè *facitor* (p. 11) *di ponti* o *papale*. Se non avessero i commentatori perduto di vista questo *pontifical* prima di giungere al verso 354, avrebbero

[1] *MS.* toujour. [2] 'fesoient' changed into 'fesoit.'
[3] *Le vers complet est:* 'God therefore can not hurt ye and be just' (*Par. Lost* IX, 698).
[4] *MS.* fier'd. [5] *MS.* creindre. [6] *MS.* creinte.
[7] *L'auteur avait d'abord écrit:* 'nel X. libro non lungi dal cominciamento.' *Il a barré ces mots qu'il a remplacés par* v. 312, *au-dessus de la ligne.*

veduto che Milton volle dire, come Dante che *Pap' è Satan*, poichè quì soggiunge:

O parent, these are thy magnifick deeds,
Thy trophies! which thou view'st as not thine own;
Thou art their author and prime architect;

dai quali due passi rapprossimati tanto ne risulta, ed io gli ho tradotti fedelmente senza essere obbligato di ammetterli nel senso dei nemici del Papa:

Or con pontifical mirabil arte
Aveano l' opra (mole di pendenti
Rupi al di sopra dell' afflitto abisso)
Condotta a fine;

e quindi:

Queste che miri opere eccelse, o padre,
Quasi non tue, son tuoi trofei: tu di esse
Sei l' autor; tu ne sei primo architetto &c.

Dirò per concludere che sembrami che la sua traduzione somigli in tutte le sue parti all' originale, ed io la leggo con più piacere e soddisfazione che le pompose ed erronee traduzioni che abbiamo in lingua italiana.—Mi prendo la libertà d' aggiungere una copia delle mie traduzioni (p. 12) a quella che mando per lei e di pregarla di farmi il favore di farla pervenire a quello di cotesti Giornalisti che le piacerà, chè venendo da parte sua ci farà attenzione, mentre, s' io la mandassi a nome mio, non se ne darebbe forse la minima briga.

Colla più sincera stima e col dovuto rispetto, ho l' onore di dichiararmi

Suo devotissimo servo,

GAETANO POLIDORI.

Ai 2. di Marzo 1841.
15, PARK VILLAGE EAST,
REGENT'S PARK,
LONDON.

Copia della Risposta:

Je ne m'occupe plus, Monsieur, de littérature et n'ai plus aucun rapport avec les Journaux; je ne saurois donc à qui faire passer votre ouvrage. Je m'empresserai de lire votre traduction; je la crois très supérieure à la mienne; je crois toutes vos observations excellentes et je suis prêt à convenir tant qu'on voudra que je me suis trompé. J'ai l'honneur d'être, Monsieur, avec une considération très distinguée,

Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur,

CHATEAUBRIAND.

Je tiens, Monsieur, à la disposition de la personne qui se presentera de votre part l'exemplaire destiné à un journaliste.

PARIS, 2 *Mars*, 1841.

LOUIS BRANDIN.

MONTARGIS.

CONCERNING THE SONNET OF THE SONNET.

M. A. Morel-Fatio has written an interesting article on this topic in the third volume of the *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*[1] (1896), of which the starting-point is the following sonnet, generally attributed to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, in the *Primera parte de las Flores de poetas illustres de España*, compiled by Pedro Espinosa, and first published at Valladolid in 1605 :

Pedis, reyna, un soneto : ya le hago :
Ya el primer verso y el segundo es hecho.
Si el tercero me sale de provecho,
Con otro verso el un quarteto os pago.
Ya llego al quinto. España, Santiago !
Fuera, que entro en el sexto ; sus, buen pecho !
Si del septimo salgo, gran derecho
Tengo a salir con vida deste trago.
Ya tenemos a un cabo los quartetos.
Que me dezis, señora ? no ando bravo ?
Mas sabe Dios si temo los tercetos ;
Y si con bien este soneto acabo,
Nunca en toda mi vida mas sonetos !
Ya deste, gloria, a Dios, he visto el cabo.

Espinosa however is by no means reliable, and it is not at all improbable that the sonnet in question is due to another Mendoza and not to the famous writer and statesman, as recent authorities are inclined to believe, and as Professor Knapp, who places the sonnet among those of doubtful authenticity, had already pointed out in the notes to his edition of Mendoza's verses (Madrid, 1877, p. 506).

My object is not to trace the various stages of the history of the sonnet of the sonnet throughout French literature as M. Morel-Fatio has done with his usual lucidity, but to show in a complementary note, that he has hardly made sufficient use of the researches of his predecessors and thereby somewhat impaired the value of his helpful contribution.

This ingenious example of poetic trifling, attributed to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, appears to have attracted the attention of

[1] M. Morel-Fatio's article was subsequently incorporated in his *Études sur l'Espagne*, troisième série, Paris, 1904, pp. 153—163.

Lope de Vega, who himself had contributed several pieces to the *Flores* of Espinosa; he wrote in imitation of his predecessor the following sonnet which López de Sedano places side by side with that attributed to Mendoza, in his *Parnaso Espãnol* (Madrid, 1776, tom. 4, pp. 22—23), and which López de Sedano, while deploring that Lope de Vega was not the inventor of this clever idea, finds much superior to the original:

Un soneto me manda hazer Violante,
Que en mi vida me he visto en tal aprieto.
Quatorze versos dizen que es soneto:
Burla burlando van los tres delante.
Yo pense que no hallara consonante,
Y estoy a la mitad de otro quarteto;
Mas, si me veo en el primer terceto,
No ay cosa en los quartetos que me espante.
Por el primer terceto voy entrando,
Y parece que entre con pie derecho,
Pues fin con este verso le voy dando.
Ya estoy en el segundo, y aun sospecho
Que voy los treze versos acabando.
Contad si son quatorze y està echo.

Lord Holland[1], as M. Morel-Fatio points out, was the first to draw attention that Lope de Vega's sonnet is to be found inserted in the middle of Act III of Lope's *Niña de plata*. It may be mentioned incidentally that Lord Holland in the same work attributes to Marino a translation of Lope's sonnet, and that Heinrich Welti[2] repeats Holland's statement. Although Marino knew Spanish well, and wrote a sonnet in that language addressed to his famous Spanish contemporary (from whom by the way he filched more than one sonnet), a careful examination of his various poetic collections has failed to disclose any such composition. In fact there does not appear to exist any direct imitation in Italian of Lope's sonnet or of that of Mendoza. However, one of the minor Marinists, a certain Paolo Abriani, has made use of a similar if not identical device[3].

Vorrei per Nuccia mia far un sonetto,
ma sento che la vena or non mi serve,
e quanto il desiderio in me piú ferve,
tanto il mio ingegno a questa impresa è inetto.
Pur mi ci vuo' provar, ché se piú aspetto,
dubito che 'l poter piú mi si snerve:
'Nuccia, com' hai per me cosi proterve
tue voglie?' Eh, non va ben questo concetto!
Voltiamo faccia e andiam da poppa a prora:
'Io canto di colei l' alta eccellenza.'

[1] *Some Account of the Lives and Writings of Lope de Vega, Carpio and Guillen de Castro.* London, 1817, tome I, p. 229.
[2] *Geschichte des Sonettes in der deutschen Dichtung.* Leipzig, 1884, p. 137.
[3] Cf. Benedetto Croce, *Lirici Marinisti.* Bari, 1910, p. 198.

No, diciam meglio e incominciamo ancora :
'Celebra, Urania, tu, l' alma presenza.'
Ma come c' entra Urania? Or su, per ora,
Far sonetti non so ; ci vuol pazienza !

The earliest imitation in sonnet form of Lope's effort, as far as I know, is that of Régnier Desmarais (1632–1713), an eminent scholar and grammarian of the latter part of the seventeenth century, who wrote verses in Latin, French, Italian and Spanish[1]. These were collected and published under the title of *Poësies de Mr l'Abbé Regnier Desmarais, Secretaire perpetuel de l'Académie Françoise*, Paris, 1707–8. On p. 91 of Vol. I we read the following sonnet, which is now not unfamiliar to students of French literature :

Sonnet imité de Lope de Vegue.

Doris, qui fait qu'aux vers quelquefois je me plais,
Me demande un Sonnet ; & je m'en desespere :
Quatorze vers, grand Dieu ! le moyen de les faire !
En voilà cependant desja quatre de faits.
Je ne pouvois d'abord trouver de rime ; mais,
En faisant on apprend à se tirer d'affaire :
Poursuivons, les Quatrains ne m'estonneront guere ;
Si du premier Terset je puis faire les frais.
Je commence au hazard ; & si je ne m'abuse,
Je n'ay pas commencé, sans l'aveu de la Muse ;
Puisqu'en si peu de temps je m'en tire si net.
J'entame le second ; & ma joye est extrême ;
Car des vers commandez j'achève le treizième ;
Comptez s'ils font quatorze ; & voilà le Sonnet.

It would appear that La Monnoye, in his notes to the later editions of Ménage's *Anti-Baillet*, was the first to quote Desmarais' sonnet (he does so in full with specific reference) as modelled on that of Lope de Vega[2]. The title of Desmarais' imitation, however, makes it clear that he did not desire to appear in borrowed plumes, and disposes, as far as he is concerned, of López de Sedano's accusation that the French have attributed 'the glory of this famous invention' to a certain modern poet of theirs. M. Morel-Fatio thinks that López de Sedano was possibly aiming at Voiture, whose celebrated rondeau of the rondeau is a less literal but

[1] I am not competent to judge of the value of Desmarais' Spanish verse. His Italian verse however seems to have aroused the admiration of at least one of his Italian contemporaries ; Francesco Redi, in the annotations to his *Bacco in Toscana* (1685), wrote as follows concerning Desmarais' powers as an Italian poet : 'Il Sig. Abate Regnier des Marais gran Letterato del nostro secolo, Segretario della nobiliss. Academica Franzese, e Accademico della Crusca scrive Prose, e Versi Toscani con tanta proprietà, purità, e finezza, che qualsisia più oculatissimo Critico non potrà mai credere, che egli non sia nato, e nutrito nel cuore della Toscana.'

[2] Cf. p. 100 of tom. VII of the 1725 Amsterdam edition of the *Jugemens des Savans* of Baillet, which contains the *Anti-Baillet* of Ménage, together with La Monnoye's observations thereon.

unacknowledged imitation of the sonnet of Lope de Vega whom Voiture may have met when he visited Madrid in 1632–3, where he had been sent by Gaston d'Orléans on a mission to Count Olivares[1]:

Ma foy, c'est fait de moy: Car Isabeau
M'a conjuré de luy faire un Rondeau.
Cela me met en une peine extréme.
Quoy treize vers, huit en *eau*, cinq en *éme*!
Je luy ferois aussi-tôt un batteau.

En voila cinq pourtant en un monceau;
Faisons en huit: en invoquant Brodeau,
Et puis mettons, par quelque stratagême,
Ma foy, c'est fait.

Si je pouvois encor de mon cerveau
Tirer cinq vers, l'ouvrage seroit beau.
Mais cependant, je suis dedans l'onziéme
Et si je croy que je fais le douziéme.
En voila treize juste au niveau
Ma foy, c'est fait[2].

M. Morel-Fatio omits to state not only that this fact had already been pointed out by Lord Holland (*op. cit.*, p. 293), but also at least three times in the seventeenth century. Ménage notes it in his *Anti-Baillet* (1692); speaking of Voiture, in the chapter entitled 'Faute de jugement de M^r^ Baillet au sujet de deux de mes Epigrammes Grecques' he says: 'Son Rondeau *Ma foi c'est fait de moi, car Isabeau*, est une imitation du Sonnet de Lopé de Véga *Un Soneto me manda hazer Violante*'; as does also Urbain Chevreau, another excellent judge of Italian and Spanish literature, in his *Œuvres Meslées* (La Haye, 1697, p. 293). Chevreau quotes Lope's sonnet in full, as does Ménage, and says in addition: 'Mais que dirons nous de ce Rondeau?

Ma foy, c'est fait de moy, car Izabeau
M'a conjuré de lui faire un Rondeau, etc.

car je suis trompé si vous n'avez cru avec beaucoup d'autres, que l'invention en est de Voiture. Le Sonnet suivant qui est de Lope de Vega, nous fera changer d'opinion: & c'est ici qu'on peut s'écrier avec plus de justice, que dans la Pompe funebre que Sarasin nous en a donnée, *És dé Lopé, és dé Lopé.*' He also reverts to the same subject in his *Chevræana* (Paris, 1697, p. 299), where he also remarks that

[1] In a letter addressed to M. Carrel de Sainte-Garde, dated Nov. 3, 1663, Chapelain, speaking of Lope's *Arte Nuevo*, adds 'Du reste, il tenoit dans son cœur pour le déreglement, et M^r^ de Voiture, qui le peut avoir veu à Madrid, m'a dit autrefois qu'à ceux qui souhaitoient en ses comédies plus de régularité, il respondoit brusquement: "*Si a plaze el auto es bueno aunque se ahorque el arte.*"' (*Lettres de Jean Chapelain*, par Ph. Tamizey de Larroque. Paris, 1883, vol. II, p. 334.)

[2] *Les Œuvres de Monsieur de Voiture.* Paris, 1706, pp. 66—67.

Voiture's chanson *Mes yeux, quel crime ai-je commis?* is borrowed from a song of Cristóbal de Castillejo ('Mis ojos que os mereci?')—for which he has not had due credit either (any more than Ménage who points out that several sonnets of Scarron are borrowed from Spanish) from those who have lately investigated the Spanish influence in the French poets of the seventeenth century. Urbain Chevreau (1613–1701) is quite forgotten nowadays, but in his time he enjoyed a great reputation for learning, and his *Œuvres Meslées* may still be profitably consulted by students of comparative literature. He was particularly well-versed in Italian and Spanish as well as in the classics, as his *Remarques*[1] on the poetry of Malherbe (which by the way he accused Ménage of having pillaged) clearly show. In early life he wrote a number of plays, and a novel called *Scandenberg* (1644). He was also a much-travelled man, and possessed a famous library on which he was reported to have expended more than 60,000 francs.

As M. Morel-Fatio did not propose to pursue the history of the sonnet of the sonnet beyond the frontiers of France, it may not appear amiss, following in the footsteps of Lord Holland and Heinrich Welti who have already furnished valuable information, to inquire what was its fate in Germany and in England.

In Germany the earliest imitation is that of Johann Burkhard Menke (1674–1732), which occurs in the fourth part of the poems printed under the name of 'Philander von der Linde,' at the beginning of the eighteenth century (1706). The model, as is at once apparent, was Voiture's rondeau and not its Spanish original:

Bey meiner Treu! es wird mir Angst gemacht;
Ich soll geschwind ein rein Sonnetgen sagen,
Und meine Kunst in vierzehn Zeilen wagen,
Bevor ich mich auf rechten Stoff bedacht;
Was reimt sich nun auf *agen* und auf *acht*?
Doch eh ich kan mein Reim-Register fragen,
Und in dem Sinn das ABC durchjagen,
So wird bereits der halbe Theil belacht.
Kann ich nun noch sechs Verse dazu tragen,
So darf ich mich mit keinen Grillen plagen:
Wolan da sind schon wieder drey vollbracht;
Und weil noch viel in meinem vollen Kragen,
So darf ich nicht am letzten Reim verzagen,
Bey meiner Treu! das Werk ist schon gemacht[2].

Menke was followed by Daniel Schiebeler in the only sonnet which the latter appears to have written, and which is here quoted from Schiebeler's *Auserlesene Gedichte* (p. 175), published in 1773 by

[1] Lately published from the manuscript by Gustave Boissière (Niort, 1909).
[2] Cf. H. Welti, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

J. J. Eschenburg, who states (following the early French authorities no doubt) that Lope de Vega is the real originator of the idea, and also mentions the sonnet of Desmarais as well as Voiture's rondeau :

Du forderst ein Sonnett von mir,
Du weisst, wie schwer ich dieses finde,
Darum, du lose Rosalinde,
Versprichst du einen Kuss dafür.
  Was ist, um einen Kuss von dir,
Das sich Myrtill nicht unterstünde?
Ich glaube fast, ich überwinde,
Sieh, zwey Quadrains stehn ja schon hier!
  Auf einmal hört es auf zu fliessen!
Nun werd' ich doch verzagen müssen!
Doch nein, hier ist schon Ein Terzett.
  Nun beb' ich doch—Wie werd' ich schliessen?
Komm Rosalinde, lass dich küssen!
Hier Schönste, hast du dein Sonnett.

H. Zech also attempted a translation of Lope's *tour de force* in his *Sonette von bayerischen Dichtern,* which is hardly worth quotation.

In England the first in the field was Thomas Edwards (1699–1757), whose sonnets, numbering about fifty in all, a moiety of which had appeared in different editions of Dodsley's *Collection of Poems,* were collected and appended to the sixth edition of his *Canons of Criticism* (1758). Edwards' effort is not particularly happy but is here cited as it is not easily accessible[1].

Capricious Wray a sonnet needs must have;
I ne'er was so put to't before—a sonnet?
Why, fourteen verses must be spent upon it.
'Tis good, however, I've conquered the first stave.
  Yet I shall ne'er find rhymes enough by half,
Said I, and found myself in the midst of the second;
If twice four verses were but fairly reckon'd
I should turn back on the hardest part and laugh.
  Thus far with good success I think I've scribled,
And of twice seven lines have clear got o'er ten.
Courage! Another 'll finish the first triplet;
Thanks to the muse, my work begins to shorten,
There's thirteen lines got through, driblet by driblet,
'Tis done! count how you will, I warrant there's fourteen.

Other variants in England are those of John Payne Collier (1789–1883), the Shakespearian critic, and of William Fitzgerald (1814–1883), bishop of Killaloe, neither of which can be said to have much literary value[2]. By far the most successful rendering in English is that of the

[1] Cf. Lord Holland, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

[2] These are noted by the Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J., in his *Sonnets on the Sonnet: an Anthology* (London, 1898), pp. 4 and 9. He also quotes (p. 16) a much freer adaptation by John Adamson (1787–1855), the biographer of Camoens. I have not had the opportunity of tracing these versions for myself, and unfortunately Father Russell's well-meaning but quite unscientific little book gives no reference of any kind.

late James Y. Gibson which Mr Samuel Waddington has included in his *Sonnets of Europe* (p. 195), and which may fitly close the series[1]:

To write a sonnet doth Juana press me,
I've never found me in such stress or pain;
A sonnet numbers fourteen lines, 'tis plain,
And three are gone, ere I can say, God bless me!
I thought that spinning rhymes might sore oppress me,
Yet here I'm midway in the last quatrain;
And if the foremost tercet I can gain,
The quatrains need not any more distress me.
To the first tercet I have got at last
And travel through it with such right good will,
That with this line I've finished it, I ween;
I'm in the second now, and see how fast
The thirteenth line runs tripping from my quill;
Hurrah, 'tis done! Count if there be fourteen!

In Spain, Lope de Vega's sonnet naturally produced a considerable number of emulators; Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly, in a recent article[2] which exhibits his usual mastery of Hispanic literature, instances, apart from the versions of Mendoza and of Lope de Vega, seven different Spanish attempts, ranging from the seventeenth—perhaps from the sixteenth—century to the present day. He also records incidentally an adaptation in the Pisan dialect by Renato Fucini—which makes it necessary to qualify somewhat what has been said above concerning Italian imitations.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

Postscript. On further enquiry I have come across Bishop Fitzgerald's version in *Notes and Queries* (7th Series, vol. v, June 9, 1888). The correspondent who sends it states that it was published in the Dublin periodical *Kottabos* (vol. II, p. 71), now extinct, over the signature 'F' (Fitzgerald). John Adamson's adaptation is also to be found in the same Journal (7th Series, vol. IV, Dec. 31, 1887), with an appended note by Adamson's son, who says that this *jeu d'esprit* was addressed by Adamson to his friend and neighbour, the late Archdeacon Coxe, then Vicar of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

L. E. K.

[1] H. Welti (*op. cit.*, p. 137) speaks of a certain 'Williams' as having attempted an English version of Lope's sonnet. I have investigated this point by referring to the works of Anna Williams (1706–1783), Helen Maria Williams (1762–1828) and Isaac Williams (1802–1865), but found no trace of any such sonnet.

[2] *Sonnets on a Sonnet*, in *A Miscellany, Presented to John Macdonald Mackay, LL.D.* Liverpool, 1914, pp. 257—265.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Some Emendations in Old English Texts.

I. *The Old English 'Edergong.'*

This word occurs only in *Christ* 1676 (according to Grein-Wülker; *Guthlac* 11 according to Gollancz, with whom I agree). The passage is as follows:

eart nu tid-fara
to þam halgan ham þær næfre hreow cymeð,
eder-gong fore yrmþum; ac þær bið engla dream,
sib and gesælignes and sawla ræst.

It has been usual to regard *edergong* as a compound of *eodor* fence, and *gong* act of going, and to interpret it as meaning 'refuge.' But this meaning does not appear to result naturally from the etymology; and besides, as Professor Toller points out (*B.-T. Supplement*, s.v.), the parallelism suggests that *edergong fore yrmþum* is approximately synonymous with *hreow* in the preceding line. Professor Toller proposes to connect the word with the Gothic *idreiga* repentance, *idreigōn* to repent. He presumably regards it as standing for **edergung*, from a verb **edergian* = *idreigōn*. On formal grounds this seems unobjectionable; the denominative verb would be stressed on the initial syllable, and the syncopation of the long vowel under these conditions has several well-known parallels. But there is no trace in O.E. of either the verb or the noun from which it is derived; and the sense of 'repentance' is not quite what the context appears to require. I therefore think that Professor Toller's ingenious and tempting suggestion must be abandoned.

I propose to read *eargung*. It is true that this verbal noun has not been found, but two instances of the construction of *eargian* with *for* are cited in the Supplement to Bosworth-Toller. If the scribe read the first three letters as *edr-*, he would naturally suppose the word to be a compound, and re-spell it accordingly. The sense appears to be satis-

factory: 'Thou art now a traveller to that holy home where never sorrow comes, [nor] failing of heart for afflictions; but there is joy of angels, peace and blessedness, and rest of souls.'

II. *Genesis* 1702–5.

Weox under wolcnum ond wriðade
mægburh Semes oð þæt mon awoc
on þære cneorisse cynebearna rim
þancolmod wer þeawum hydig.

In line 1704 both the construction and the sense would be improved by reading *sum* for *rim*. In O.E. handwriting ꝑum would easily be mistaken for ꝑim.

In line 1705 I propose to substitute *þare wæs haten* for *þeawum hydig*. The change may at first sight appear violent, but I think its necessity can be proved. The paraphrast had the name *Thare* (= Terah) before him in the Vulgate, and he can have had no reason for leaving the patriarch anonymous, especially as the name was needed to explain his subsequent use of *þares eafora* as a periphrasis for Abraham. Besides, the description *þancolmod wer*, applied to a man about whom nothing whatever is known except his name and his place in the genealogy, decidedly looks as if it were introduced for the sake of alliteration with the name. It is, of course, necessary to account for the corruption; but this is quite easy to do. If the scribe was copying a MS. in which the last four letters of *haten* were illegible, and if (as is most likely) the name *þare* was unknown to him, he would naturally suppose that *þarewæs h*.... was a blunder that needed correction. The word most obviously suggested by this apparently unmeaning sequence of letters would be *þeawæs*. I assume that the scribe hit upon *hydig* as the likeliest five-letter word beginning with *h* to make sense in this connexion, and that as the genitive singular struck him as not quite satisfactory he altered it to the dative plural.

III. *Daniel* 645–7.

Ne lengde þa leoda aldor
witegena wordcwyde ac he wide bead
metodes mihte þær he meld ahte.

Although the MS. reading *lengde* is not impossible, the shade of meaning that must be assigned to it in this passage does not seem to be quite paralleled in any of the known examples of *lengan* or of the compound *gelengan*. It may therefore be worth while to suggest that the

original reading may have been *lēgnde* (= *līgnde*). Compare the O.S. *lōgnian*, which occurs in a similar context ('lōgniad iuwa lēra,' *Hel.* 1341). The confusion of *gn* and *ng* occurs elsewhere in O.E.; e.g. *fræng* for *frægn*.

IV. *Leechdoms* II, p. 52, l. 8.

The prescription for the cure of 'the lower toothache,' as printed by Cockayne, reads as follows: 'Slit mid þe foþorne oð þæt hi bleden.' Cockayne interprets the supposed word *foþorn* as *tenaculum*, apparently intended to mean 'forceps'—not a very likely instrument, one would think, to be used for scarifying the gums. This explanation, founded on an impossible etymology (*fō-þorn* = thorn-catcher!), is accepted by Bosworth-Toller ('*Fóþorn*, a fothorn, surgeon's instrument, *tenaculum*'). Sweet's queried suggestion, 'lancet,' is more plausible, but I suspect that *foþorn* is a ghost-word. The unidiomatic use of the definite article, and the unusual form of the instrumental case, render the text suspicious, and the true reading is probably *mid þēfeþorne*, 'with a bramble-spine.' Possibly **þefoþorn* may have been a legitimate spelling of the word (cf. *heagoðorn* in the Corpus Glossary); if so, there is nothing to correct but the word-division. The word ordinarily denotes either a bramble-bush or some medical preparation from the plant; but there is no reason why it may not have been used, like the simple *þorn*, for a prickle. That a thorn was sometimes employed as a surgical instrument is shown by *Leechdoms* II, 106: 'Gif hie [*sc.* poccas] utslean ælcne man sceall aweg adelfan mid þorne.'

V. '*Spider*' *in Old English.*

The earliest example of the word *spider* hitherto known is in the *Ayenbite*, where the form is *spiþre*. In the *Oxford English Dictionary* an O.E. **spīþre* fem. is conjectured. The word, however, actually occurs in O.E. as *spīþra* masc., though its existence has been disguised by a scribal or editorial mistake. In *Leechdoms* II, 142, Cockayne prints 'Wiþ þon gif hunta gebite mannan, þæt is swiþra,' and translates 'In case a hunting spider bite a man, that is, the stronger spider.' The sentence as thus read and interpreted is ungrammatical, and there can be no doubt that *spiþra* should be read instead of *swiþra*. Whether the error is in the MS. or due to misreading on Cockayne's part I have not had opportunity to ascertain. From the facsimile page given by Cockayne the forms of *p* and *w* in the MS. seem to be fairly easy to distinguish.

The impossible 'O.E. *spīder*' given in most English dictionaries is, as was duly pointed out in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, due to a mistake of Cockayne's. He prints (*Leechdoms* III, 42, in a charm) 'Her com ingangan in spider wiht,' but the MS. has clearly *inspidenwiht*. There is some appearance of an erasure in the *n*, but the letter cannot possibly have been *r*, and Cockayne's translation, 'a spider wight,' does not suit the context. The words are clearly corrupt, but no satisfactory emendation has occurred to me.

HENRY BRADLEY.

OXFORD.

A PASSAGE IN 'SALOMON AND SATURN.'

The prose *Salomon and Saturn* is printed in Thorpe's *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica*, p. 110 seq. In answer to the question, what are the eight pounds by weight called, of which Adam was made? Solomon is made to say: 'fifte wæs gyfe pund, þanon him wæs geseald se fat and geðang.' Kemble (*Ælfric Society* no. 13), in a text so incorrect that it can hardly be taken from the MS., reads 'se fæt and geþang,' and translates: 'the fifth was a pound of grace, whence were given him his fat and growth.' Bosworth-Toller, relying on and quoting only this passage, has: 'Geþang, *growth*.' I do not know how the mistake arose, or how fat came to be regarded as a product of grace, presumably a by-product (as in Mr Chadband); but the MS. (Cotton Vitel. A. XV, the Beowulf MS.) has quite clearly and unmistakably: 'fifte wæs gyfe pund, þanon hym wæs geseald sefa 7 geðang' (the fifth was a pound of grace, whence was given to him mind and thought). I lay stress on the perfect legibility of the text, because *sefa* is regarded as a word belonging entirely to the poetic vocabulary.

ALFRED J. WYATT.

CAMBRIDGE.

TWO PASSAGES IN BALE'S 'JOHN, KING OF ENGLAND.'

Act I, ll. 450–8.

It cannot escape remark that in the lengthy note entitled 'Religions,' given by Mr John S. Farmer in his edition of Bale's *King John* (*The Dramatic Writings of John Bale*: Early English Drama Society), which

treats of the list of 'Monks, canons, and friars, most excellent divines,' detailed by Clergy in answer to King John's questioning, we have several gaps and queries. For example in the Word-List under *Crucifers* (p. 334) Mr Farmer writes 'Crucifers? cross-bearers.' There are however two Orders named Crucifers, Friars and Canons. The friars are the Trinitarians founded by S. John de Matha (1154–1213) and commonly known in England as the Crutched (*crossed*) Friars from the blue and red cross worn on their white scapular and on the black cloaks. The Canons of the Holy Cross (*Croisiers* or *Crociferi*) are mentioned as early as 1187. They are especially to be found in Brabant. The *Colombines* (unexplained by Mr Farmer) are the 'Apostolic Clerks, Gesuati of S. Jerome,' founded by S. Giovanni Colombino of Siena. This Congregation which had a noted church in Venice (I Gesuati alle Zattere) was suppressed by Clement IX (1667–70). *Lorettes*, pilgrims who had visited and bound themselves by vows at the Santa Casa of Loretto. *Honofrines*, Hermits of S. Jerome, Hieronymites; from S. Honuphrius the hermit, a great patron of the Order. In Rome this Order is now settled at S. Onofrio. They have nothing to do with the Franciscans as Mr Farmer wrongly asserts in a later note. *Paulines*, not Trinitarians as Mr Farmer says, but Hermits of S. Paul, a well-known company of anchorites. *Fuligines*, mystic Franciscans who set great store on the writings of the famous ecstatica Blessed Angela of Foligno.

Act I, l. 741.

By sweet Saint Benet's cup. Mr Farmer's note (p. 337) on this familiar oath is entirely erroneous. S. Benedict did not join a monastic order at Dijon, nor was he ever cellarer. The allusion here is to the attempt made to poison the Saint by an abandoned community who were shamed and angered by his holy life and example. On the cup being presented to him in the refectory Benedict, as was his custom, blessed it with the sign of the cross; the vessel broke and its contents were spilled. This scene is constantly represented in art, and S. Benedict is often depicted holding a broken cup, as in pictures by Antonio Solario, in a famous predella of Andrea del Sarto.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

TWICKENHAM.

A Crashaw and Shelley Parallel.

It has, perhaps, not been pointed out that the forty-seventh stanza of Shelley's *Adonais* offers a strong resemblance to some lines in one of Crashaw's funeral elegies and is probably an unconscious reminiscence of them. The poem in question has various titles in the three original editions in which it appears. In *Steps to the Temple; Sacred Poems, With other Delights of the Muses* (1646) it is headed 'Upon Mr Staninough's Death'; in the second edition (1648) 'At the Funerall of a young Gentleman'; and in *Carmen Deo Nostro* (1652) 'Death's Lecture and the Funeral of a young Gentleman.' The text of the extract given below is derived from *Carmen Deo Nostro* through the Cambridge edition (ed. Waller, 1904), p. 292. I have italicized the more noticeable verbal correspondences, though the general thought of the two passages, in spite of obvious differences, is not less strikingly parallel.

Death's Lecture etc., ll. 10—20.

Come man;
Hyperbolized Nothing! *know thy span*;
Take thine own measure here down, down, & bow
Before thy self in thine idæa; thou
Huge emptynes! contract thy self; & *shrinke*
All thy Wild [wide 1648] circle *to a Point.* O *sink*
Lower & lower yet; till thy leane size
Call heavn to look on thee with n[a]rrow eyes.
Lesser & lesser yet; till thou begin
To show a face, fitt to confesse thy Kin,
Thy neig[h]bourhood to Nothing.

Adonais, st. xlvii.

Who mourns for Adonais? oh *come* forth,
Fond wretch! and *know thyself* and him aright.
Clasp with thy panting soul the pendulous Earth;
As from a centre, dart thy spirit's light
Beyond all worlds, until its spacious might
Satiate the void circumference: then *shrink*
Even *to a point* within our day and night;
And keep thy heart light, lest it make thee *sink*
When hope has kindled hope, and lured thee to the brink.

There is a further parallel in *Prometheus Unbound,* Act I, 417–22:

Mercury. Yet pause, and plunge
Into Eternity, where recorded time,
Even all that we imagine, age on age,
Seems but a point, and the reluctant mind
Flags wearily in its unending flight,
Till it sink dizzy, blind, lost, shelterless.

L. C. Martin.

Copenhagen.

The Method of Formation of Old English Place-names in '-hāeme,' '-saetan,' '-tūningas.'

It is well known that the Anglo-Saxon Land Charters collected by Kemble and Birch include a good many descriptions of boundaries written in Anglo-Saxon. These descriptions have a special interest when the names of modern parishes appear in them in a form which is obviously more nearly original than any that we can obtain from Doomsday Book, or from other Anglo-Norman and Plantagenet sources. Often the place-name appears in a form which denotes, not the area which has since become a parish, but the inhabitants of that area: for example, while *Beohhahammes mearc* (Birch, vol. 3, p. 609) means 'the boundary of Beckenham,' the meaning of *Biohahhema mearc* (Birch, vol. 2, p. 113) and of its variant *Biohhaema mearc* (Kemble, No. 657) is 'the boundary of the people of Beckenham.' The spellings *Biohahhema* and *Biohhaema* long puzzled me and I was tempted to correct them to *Biohhahaema* on the analogy of *Beohhahammes*; but I have recently made a discovery which gives me reason to believe that the form *Biohhaema* is correct.

A similar formation puzzled Mr W. H. Stevenson in 1902. Writing on the subject of 'Dr Guest and the English Conquest of South Britain,' Mr Stevenson (*English Historical Review*, vol. 17, p. 629 note) alluded to the fact that *Grimsaetan* means the inhabitants of *Grimanleah* (*i.e.* Grimley, Worc.), and he suggested that the personal name implied in this place-name has two forms, *Grimma* (with a genitive *Grimman*) and *Grim* (with a genitive *Grimes*), the former being used in *Grimanleah* and the latter in *Grimsaetan*. Accordingly, Mr Stevenson suggested that *Grimsaetan* was miscopied for *Grimessaetan*. It now appears, however, that the omission of the genitive suffix both in *Biohhaeme* and in *Grimsaetan* is a regular feature of the process of word-formation. The key to the solution of the difficulty is afforded by the name of Kingston Bagpuize (Berks.), which happens to occur in the Abingdon Charters in three different forms. The place itself is *Cingestun* (Birch, vol. 3, p. 545), but its inhabitants are *Cinghaeme* (Birch, vol. 3, p. 228), or *Cingtuningas* (Birch, vol. 3, p. 258). These forms suggest that where use is made of the suffixes (such as *-hāeme*, *-ingas*, *-tūningas*, *-leagingas*, *-sāete*, *-sāetan*, *-ware*) which denote the inhabitants of a place, the place-name, to which the suffix is added, may reject, before receiving the suffix, not only such terminations as *-ham* (*-hamm*), *-tūn*, *-land*, *-lea*(*g*), *-den*, *-ig*, *-burh*, *-beorh*, *-heall*, *-wiell*, but also the genitive

suffix (if any) which precedes any one of these terminations: for example, *Billestun* (Bilston, Staffs.) offers us the form *Bilsaetan* (Kemble, No. 650); *Loccesleag* (Loxley, Warw.) *Locsaetan* (Kemble, No. 651); *Ombersleag* (Ombersley, Worc.) *Ombersaetan* (Birch, vol. 1, p. 502); *Baddesig* (Badsey, Worc.) *Badsaetan* (Birch, vol. 2, p. 83); *Lillesheall* (Lilleshall, Salop) *Lilsaetan* (Birch, vol. 3, p. 355); and *Doddahamm* (Doddenham, Worc.) *Dodhaeme* (Birch, vol. 1, p. 326).

There are, of course, a number of instances where a rejection of the place-suffix occurs without there being any genitive suffix preceding it and capable of being dropped: for example, Drayton in Daventry (Northants.) offers us the form *Draeghaeme*, while *Igtun* (near Worthy, Hants.) gives *Igsaetan*; *Crohlea* (Crowle, Worc.) has *Crohhaeme*, but Elmley Lovett (Worc.) *Elmesaetan* and Moseley (Worc.) *Mossaetan*; Ashton, Bourton, Milton, Netherton, Uppington and Steventon all offer us names in *-hāēme—Aeschaeme, Burghaeme, Middelhaeme, Neotherehaeme, Uppinghaeme*, and *Stifingehaeme*; similarly, Bampton Aston (Oxon.) and Hinton on the Green (Glouc.) have *Easthaeme* and *Hinhaeme*, though Hinton Waldrist (Berks.) has *Heantunningas*; Spetchley (Worc.) has *Spaechaeme*, Campden *Campsaetan*, Chidden *Citware*, Buckland (Devon) *Bocsaetan*. Buckland (Dorset) *Buchaeme*, Sedgeberrow *Secghaeme*, Inkberrow *Incsaetan*, Crudwell *Cruddesaetan*, and Bexhill *Baexware*.

G. H. Wheeler.

Surbiton.

Quelques Exemples anglo-normands d'une Négation irrationnelle dans des Phrases concessives.

On lit dans le *Roman de philosophie* de Simund de Freine (éd. Matzke), v. 499–502:

> Ewe ad memes la manére:
> Ja *ne* seit si bele o clére,
> Ki de rien la truble u muet
> Parfund veer ne la puet;

(C'est à dire: 'L'eau a la même nature: quelque belle et claire qu'elle soit, on ne peut y regarder jusqu'au fond, pour peu qu'on la trouble.')

v. 523–4:

> Chescun i ad ovel dreit
> Ja si pauvres hom *ne* seit;

v. 848–50:

> N'est si pussant homme en vie(,)
> Ki de meinte rien n'eit faute,
> Ja *n'* eit dignité si haute;

(C'est à dire: 'Il n'y a pas d'homme si puissant qu'il n'ait besoin de rien, pour grande que soit sa dignité.')

v. 861–2:

Hom n'ad pas quant qu'il vodreit,
Ja si riche rei *ne* seit.

On lit dans un fabliau (*Recueil général*, VI, p. 200):

Ne est dame ne damoisele,
Ne seit ele ja si bele,
Si sa amour desirrez
E de vous amer la prierez,
Qe s'amour ne vous grantira.

Dans un poème *Du bounté des femmes*, publié par M. Paul Meyer (*Romania*, XV, pages 316 etc., v. 174–7):

E dune devom plus obeier
Femme par droit e bien server
Qe nul home qe soit vivant,
Ja *ne* seit il si puissaunt.

Comp. aussi *Ja n'eust home tant vers dieu mespris* dans un *Purgatoire de S. Patrice* (éd. Vising); et *Ja ne seit il si grant mettre* dans *Melior et Ydoine* (*Romania*, XXXVII, 240).

C'est surtout chez Bozon que l'on trouve cette tournure; dans la *Plainte d'Amour* (éd. Vising), v. 193–8:

Ne seit ele ja si mesentecché,
Si Coveitise l'eit pris a gre,
L'envancera.
E si vers li ad querele,
Ne seit ele ja si bone e bele,
Ele faudera;

ibid. v. 745–7:

Povres home de gentil lyn,
Ne eyt il ja la quer si fyn,
Li faut lignage;

dans son *Char d'orgueil*, dont M. Paul Meyer a donné quelques extraits et que je compte publier en entier prochainement, fol. 5 r°:

Mas qe lor atyl ja si ben *ne* seit fest (=fait);

ibid. fol. 7 r°:

Mult lor greve sermon, ja sy poy *ne* endure;

et dans son poème *De la bonté des femmes*, publié par M. Paul Meyer dans les *Contes Moralisés*, p. XXXVIII:

Bone feme estable et leale,
Ja *ne* seit ele si trebele,
Mout bien entent.

Comme on le voit, ce *ne* se trouve toujours combiné avec *ja* et *si* ou *tant*; cette combinaison est l'équivalent de la tournure anglaise *never so,* et de la tournure scandinave *aldrig så* (voir l'article de M. Collinson, *The Irrational Negative in Concessive Sentences, Modern Language Review*, t. x, pages 362–3). Il est probable que quelques auteurs anglo-normands—ils sont rares—ont adopté ou imité l'usage anglais. Ils n'ont certainement pas pris cet usage de *ne* dans le français du continent, car je ne crois pas qu'il y existe.

Johan Vising.

Göteborg.

REVIEWS.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. v. Collected by Oliver Elton. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 8vo. vi + 171 pp.

Of the six essays in this volume two are concerned mainly with questions of English metre and rhythm, three are studies of certain English writers, and one, involving the examination of several English place-names, is of philological interest. *Rhythm in English verse, prose and speech*, by D. S. MacColl, is a contribution of unusual importance, embodying the results of long-continued investigation, and dealing in a masterly way with problems of extreme difficulty. It is evident that Mr MacColl understands the details not only of the theory which he champions, but of those theories also to which he is opposed. The majority of readers, however, will find it no light task to follow Mr MacColl's exposition of his views. To do so, we need in the first place a fair knowledge of the current methods of scanning Greek, Latin, and English verse. This may reasonably be looked for in an educated Englishman of literary sympathies. In the second place a considerable acquaintance with musical technique is requisite. This, we are inclined to think, will be found wanting in most of those who turn to Mr MacColl's pages. Our countrymen do not often combine a love of literature with an expert knowledge of music. Those, however, who enjoy the double qualification will read and re-read this essay with ever-increasing profit. Mr MacColl begins by scouting the prevalent theory that classical verse depended on quantity, while modern English verse depends on accent. In his opinion quantity and accent co-exist in both metrical systems.

Selecting Professor Saintsbury as 'the protagonist on the anti-musical side,' Mr MacColl charges him with vagueness and inconsistency in explaining the terms 'foot,' 'long,' and 'short,' as used in English prosody. The definiteness, which on these points is so essential to a scientific treatment of metre, can in Mr MacColl's view be attained only by the 'common-sense application of the universal laws of musical rhythm.' This, he assures us, was the practice of the ancient Greek metrists. 'For every element in the modern musical notation of rhythm the Greek verse-notation had an equivalent.' In fact the Greek metrical system, so far from being non-musical, was confessedly musical, and differed from modern musical rhythm only in notation. Following Sidney Lanier, to whose *Science of English Verse*, first

published in 1888, he acknowledges his great indebtedness, Mr MacColl asserts that 'verse-rhythm is music-rhythm, and may be represented by the same notation.' He gives examples of the application of musical notation to English verse; and handles objections that have been raised, or may conceivably be raised, against this method. On the ground that verse would be a fantastic imposition upon language, if the collocation of measured feet out of which it builds its lines were not present in habitual speech, Mr MacColl argues very soundly that prose, and even ordinary speech, are rhythmic. His instances, which to our regret do not include an extract from Walt Whitman, are chosen from Coleridge, Gibbon, De Quincey, Henry James, Bacon, Newman, and the *Morning Post.* Arranged and accented by Mr MacColl, they make delightfully instructive reading, and in his opinion show that the musical law of rhythm, beside explaining the structure of English verse, underlies the structure not only of 'numerous' prose, but of all prose and speech. In conclusion, we recommend Mr MacColl's essay to the attention of all metrical experts.

Mr A. Blyth Webster in his essay entitled *Translation from Old English* pleads for the revival of the Old English alliterative verse-system in modern English literature, particularly in attempts to translate poems like the *Beowulf.* He discusses very fully the reasons why William Morris' rendering of the *Beowulf* into modern alliterative verse is so complete a failure. 'By every means in his power,' writes Mr Webster, 'he increased the archaism of his style, keeping the word-order of the original, preserving much of the old construction and syntax, and working for the most part on a method which must be called that of transliterating eighth-century English.' When in addition to this just and sober criticism we read Mr Webster's typical quotations from Morris' *Beowulf,* among them, for instance, these two lines,

> Over the Lake Street thus have come leading
> Hither o'er holm-ways hieing in ring-stem,

we see that Morris adopted a vocabulary which eliminated all prospect of success from his work. More attractive, however, are the lines from Morris' Morality *Love is Enough,* lines which may be allowed almost to justify Mr Webster's claim that they 'conform to the modern genius of the language while remaining true to its earliest and native instinct for rhythm.' The first four lines of Dr Bridges' *Christmas Eve,* quoted by Mr Webster, indicate the best possibilities of this form of verse in modern English. But why are they followed by a rhyming couplet which entirely neutralizes the effect of the preceding lines? Mr Webster writes suggestively on the origin and structure of Old English verse, seeing in Wagner's preference of alliteration to rhyme, in verse intended to be set to music, a possible explanation of the use of alliteration in Old English verse, the public delivery of which was undoubtedly accompanied by the harp. The essayist concludes his theoretical discourse by practical example, and courageously offers to the public his own alliterative rendering into modern English of a passage from

the opening of the *Beowulf*. In spite of certain blemishes, such as the use of 'bade' for 'bidden,' and the employment of the word 'baby,' which is almost colloquial and certainly out of keeping with epic dignity, we are of opinion that Mr Webster's effort is the best specimen of *Beowulf* translation that we have come across. But the rugged majesty and close-knit energy of the original have vanished in the process of transmutation. To us such loss seems inevitable, for we hold that all modern renderings of the *Beowulf*, whether alliterative or not, are foredoomed to failure simply because a language in its synthetic stage cannot be adequately represented by the same language in its analytic stage.

Turning to the purely literary studies we find in Mr A. E. Taylor's essay, *The Novels of Mark Rutherford*, a sympathetic, and at the same time just, estimate of the work of a remarkable writer, still too little known to the average novel-reader. From his own personal experience Mr Taylor testifies to the fidelity with which Mark Rutherford portrays the Calvinistic Dissenters of the mid-Victorian era. As the record of a type that has now almost vanished in the light of higher education Mr Taylor sees in Mark Rutherford's books a series of social documents from which the future historian will be able to draw material for a full presentment of nineteenth-century England. The Calvinistic Dissenters, as Mr Taylor would be the first to admit, were certainly not a pleasant people, with their ignorance, vulgarity and self-satisfaction. The reader may pardonably turn away from the contemplation of them. Still they were once a part of England, and the student of England's moral and social development is compelled to take account of them.

In regard to the theme of Mark Rutherford's stories Mr Taylor remarks: 'The sense of tragedy,—or rather, for the word is perhaps too strong, let me say, the sense of trouble—which pervades our writer's work is, in fact, chiefly due to his preoccupation with the internal struggle of a soul which is called on by the accident of its surroundings or its early training to grapple with problems it will not leave untouched and is not equal to solving.' The end of the spiritual conflict is peace arrived at by a Stoic submission to the inevitable. It is this tame acquiescence in things as they are, this acceptance of defeat, which in our judgment renders Mark Rutherford's stories so extremely unattractive to the typical Englishman, who loves to see the hero emerge from the fight not a subdued and broken man, but triumphant over his difficulties, and a source of hope to those who are still struggling. Fortunately for his literary reputation Mark Rutherford has a style which wins the admiration of the very reader whom his subjects and his philosophy repel. Its austerity of diction, its simple directness in narrative and description, its restrained pathos and gentle irony are all duly noted by Mr Taylor and illustrated by well-chosen quotations.

Mr F. Melian Stawell contributes a study of Shelley's *Triumph of Life*. The general impression which this magnificent poem leaves on the reader's mind has been described in a well-known passage by J. A. Symonds in his monograph on Shelley. At its conclusion he

wrote: 'But how Shelley meant to solve the problems he has raised, by what sublime philosophy he purposed to resolve the discords of this revelation more soul-shattering than Daniel's *Mene*, we cannot even guess.' Mr Stawell, however, does not shrink from hazarding a conjecture. On the strength of the few additional lines which Dr Garnett has discovered, and taking into consideration Shelley's frequently expressed hope that evil would be vanquished at last, Mr Stawell contends that the poem, if it had been finished, would have included a vision in which Life the Conqueror would be conquered, and Love, untrammelled and unperverted, would rise triumphant to fold 'over the world its healing wings.' Some readers will no doubt gladly welcome Mr Stawell's suggestion, but with others it will not find a moment's favour, so relentlessly pessimistic in their opinion is the tenor of the whole poem. The various influences that went to the shaping of this masterpiece in Shelley's imagination are well indicated by Mr Stawell. Among its spiritual fathers may be reckoned Rousseau, Goethe, Petrarch, Dante, and Calderon. As for the enigmas of thought and expression with which the poem abounds Mr Stawell has some illuminating word to say of each. In fine, this essay provides a stimulating and well-informed commentary on a subject that admittedly requires it.

In *Emily Brontë—a Reconsideration* Mr J. C. Smith exhibits neither the sentimental pity nor the indiscriminate adulation which are so common with the admirers of the Brontës. He is himself their admirer, a very sincere one, but at the same time he is far from being their blind devotee. It is exhilarating to read him when he writes of Emily that 'happiness flowed in upon her from the homely round of duty, the eager pursuit of knowledge, and the glory of summer skies.' This is the picture of a healthy woman with a contented mind, and we are grateful to Mr Smith for it. Like most people, however, who possess the artistic temperament, Emily had an inner life. Religious in the accepted sense of the word she was not, but, to quote Mr Smith, 'this home-lover, this contemner of heaven, was at heart a visionary, a natural mystic.' And again: 'That experience, that ἕνωσις or immediate union with the divine, which Porphyry tells us that his master attained four times in six years and he himself once, that blinding experience had been Emily's.'

In *Shirley* Charlotte describes Emily's visions and trances, assigning them to Shirley Keeldar whose personality is borrowed from that of Emily. In one of Emily's newly-published fragments she speaks, as Mr Smith says, 'without a parable,'

> I'm happiest now when most away
> I can tear my soul from its mould of clay,
> On a windy night when the moon is bright,
> And my eye can wander through worlds of light,
> When I am not, and none beside,
> Nor earth, nor sea, nor cloudless sky,
> But only spirit wandering wide
> Through infinite immensity.

With this mystic element in her nature, what kind of novel was Emily Brontë likely to write when she turned to prose fiction? The answer is found in *Wuthering Heights* with its description of the immutable, immortal passion that lived in Heathcliff and Catherine, making her still present to him even after she had died, and bringing Heathcliff himself with exultant ecstasy through those three terrible days of solitude and starvation by which he passed to a complete reunion with the only being he had ever loved.

English Place-Names and Teutonic Sagas, written with the lucidity and moderation which always characterize Professor Moorman's work, is an attempt to discover what light is thrown upon the origin, or growth, of certain great Teutonic sagas, the *Beowulf* and the *Nibelungenlied*, by an investigation of English place-names. Dr Moorman begins by insisting on our almost complete ignorance of the events that happened in England during the fifth and sixth centuries. He argues that, beside the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, to whom as a rule the work of conquest is exclusively attributed, other Germanic-speaking tribes settled in this island and left their mark on its local nomenclature. Among such tribes may have been representatives of the Geats. With them they would bring their traditions of the mythic Beowa and the historic Beowulf, for fifty years king of their old fatherland, and on this soil construct from such traditions the *Beowulf* epic. Is there, however, any evidence in favour of this assumed immigration of Geats into England? The early historians, as Dr Moorman frankly admits, afford none. He turns, therefore, to English place-names in the hope of supplying this deficiency.

In the North Riding of Yorkshire are three places, named respectively Gilling (near Richmond), Gilling (near Helmsley), and Gillamoor (near Helmsley). The first is usually, but by no means always, identified with Bede's *Ingetlingum*; in Domesday it is found as *Ghellinghes*, *Ghellinges*, and *Gellinges*. The second appears in Domesday as *Ghellinge* and *Gellinge*; the third as *Gedlingesmore*. In these various forms Dr Moorman finds traces of a supposed tribe of *Gēatlingas*. The name, which does not occur elsewhere, is explained by him as meaning 'the people connected with the Geats,' or 'the little Geats.' We do not believe that any Teutonic tribe was ever known by a name with such significations. In support of his interpretation Dr Moorman quotes 'Petty France' and 'Little Marlow.' But these are not tribal names, and so are outside the question. The lack, indeed, of any parallel to *Gēatlingas* as a tribal name, with either of the meanings above assigned to it, constitutes a very serious weakness in Dr Moorman's argument.

As to the phonetics of the matter Dr Moorman remarks: 'It is obvious that Bede's *Getling* is the form from which the later *Gedling* of D.B. *Gedlingesmore* has developed by the voicing of *t* to *d* before the voiced *l*, and that the forms *Ghelling*, *Gelling*, and *Gilling* are a further development from *Gedling* with the assimilation of *dl* to *ll*.' And again, after mentioning the etymology proposed by Dr Bradley,

who takes *Ingetlingum* as 'among the Gythlingas,' and after pointing out that the substitution of *e* for *y* is Kentish, and not earlier than the ninth century, he says: 'What is more likely is that the *e* in *Getling*,—originally long but afterwards shortened before the *tl*,—has proceeded, by *i*-mutation or otherwise, from an original *ēa*.' Discarding inflexions and Bede's preposition, and marking postulated forms with an asterisk, we may briefly state the series of changes thus: (1) O.E. **Gēatling*; (2) O.E. *Gētling* (Bede); (3) O.E. **Gĕtling*; (4) O.E. **Gĕdling*; (5) D.B. *Gelling*, etc.; (6) M.E. *Gilling*. The change from *ēa* to *ē* by *i*-mutation in Northumbrian is, of course, sound enough. The shortening of the *ē* before two consonants in O.E. is open to doubt. The change from intervocalic *tl* to *dl* in O.E. may be allowed on the strength of such a form as the Northumbrian *sedles*, genitive of a noun whose nominative is variously *sethel*, *seatul*, *sætil* (Sievers, *O.E. Grammar*, § 196, note 2). The further O.E. change from *dl* to *ll* is difficult to parallel; and yet Dr Moorman must accept it, unless he is prepared to maintain that the D.B. spellings are either clerical errors, or belong to a much later date than that generally assigned to D.B., viz., 1086. Several students of D.B. are in favour of this later date for many of its spellings; and the adoption of this view by Dr Moorman would certainly postpone the completion of the process of assimilation to a more suitable period. It thus appears that on its phonological side the proposed derivation wants overhauling and strengthening.

In further confirmation of his theory of a Geat immigration into the North Riding Dr Moorman adduces several personal names, Beowulf, Hygelac, Herebeald, Hereric, Heardred, which, outside of the *Beowulf* epic, occur almost exclusively in Northern records, such as the Durham *Liber Vitæ*, and the works of Simeon of Durham and Bede. It must be allowed that these coincidences tend to show that there was a closer connexion between the *Beowulf* and Northumbria than there was between the *Beowulf* and the non-Northumbrian districts of England.

But the appeal to place-names is not yet done with. In several Yorkshire place-names Dr Moorman finds names borne by personages mentioned in the *Beowulf*. Thus in his opinion Hrethel occurs in Riddlesden and Rillington; Hrothgar in Rogerthorpe; Hroar, a contracted form of Hrothgar, in Ruston and Royston; Hrothmund in Romanby; Hrothulf in the unidentified *Roudeluestorp* of D.B.; Beow, a contracted form of Beowulf, in Beeston; and Grendel in Grindale. Unfortunately every one of these place-names is susceptible of a solution which in no wise suggests *Beowulf* influence. If not a single line of that poem had survived to our time, we should still be at no loss to provide reasonable etymologies in every instance. It follows, therefore, that these place-names cannot be claimed as unimpeachable witnesses to the truth of Dr Moorman's theory. Finally, he reminds us of the Siggeot and Geat who are found in the genealogies of the Northumbrian kings, and suggests that the pedigree-maker of the ninth century 'wished to bring into prominence some floating tradition that, when the kingdoms of Deira and Bernicia had been won from the Britons,

the Geat people had borne a share in the conquest.' Dr Moorman admits that any one of these strands of evidence, when isolated from its fellows, may be unable to bear the strain put upon it. At the same time he claims that, taken all together, they furnish a body of evidence which cannot well be regarded as negligible.

Assuming for the occasion that his hypothesis of a Geat immigration into the North Riding is correct, Dr Moorman proceeds to show that this immigration took place in the sixth century, perhaps towards its end, after the death of Beowulf, perhaps in its earlier part, while Beowulf was still reigning over the continental Geats. In the latter case we must suppose that the Geats in England kept in touch with the Geats of Scandinavia, and learned from them the details of Beowulf's heroic achievements. Dr Moorman sees clearly that it is questionable whether the Beowulf epos could have come into being in the North Riding Gillingshire. 'The composition of such a work,' he writes, 'presupposes an advanced stage of culture and civilization and a somewhat broad outlook upon life.' There are in the poem several indications that its author had known life in a court of great refinement and splendour. Such a court was that of Eadwine (617–633). There Dr Moorman thinks it likely that the 'Geat lays of Beowulf were finally welded into the epic that we possess to-day.' Undoubtedly Dr Moorman's theory has much to commend it as a working hypothesis. It removes several difficulties connected with the origin and composition of the *Beowulf*. Some of the links in the chain of evidence we regard as weak, but we think it not impossible that Dr Moorman may be able to strengthen them and even add to their number.

In the second part of his essay Dr Moorman endeavours to use certain English place-names for the purpose of showing a possible connexion between England and that element in the *Nibelungenlied* which may be styled the Sigemund-Siegfried Saga. The details of the saga are generally regarded as mythical. Dr Moorman, however, puts forward the suggestion that Sigemund, the father of Siegfried, may actually have been a Burgundian exile who took refuge in England in the early part of the fifth century, after the Burgundian kingdom had been shattered by the successive attacks of the Romans and the Huns. He pleads very wisely for the acceptance of the Sigemund passage in the *Beowulf* as authentic and not corrupt. If the exploits attributed to the Sigurd of the *Völsunga Saga* and the Siegfried of the *Nibelungenlied* are in the *Beowulf* attributed to his father Sigemund, the reason is that the *Beowulf* poet knew the famous story in its earlier form at a date when the glory of the son had not yet outshone that of the father. In the *Beowulf* Sigemund is styled *Wælsing* and *Wælses eafora*. These expressions Dr Moorman confines to the meaning of 'son of Wæls,' though they might just as well signify 'descendant of Wæls.' We do not see what he gains by this limitation. In the *Beowulf* we are told how Sigemund slew the wondrous dragon, and won the dragon's hoard; but we are not told how Sigemund bathed himself in the dragon's blood, an incident which has a prominent place

in Siegfried's story as preserved in the *Nibelungenlied*. Presumably this incident had not yet been added to the story when the *Beowulf* was composed. Dr Moorman claims to find proof in English place-names that this incident had its birth on English soil. The personal name, Sigemund, occurs as the first element in many place-names. But Dr Moorman does not enlist all such place-names indiscriminately in defence of his theory. He selects those only which are associated with barren, unenclosed mountains, crags of rock, streams and springs. The selected place-names are Symond's Yat, a well-known limestone crag, through an opening in which flows the river Wye; Simon Seat and Simon Fell, mountain-peaks in the West Riding of Yorkshire; *Simundeburne*, in Northumberland (1230); *Simonseth*, also in Northumberland (temp. Ed. I); *Simundkelde*, in North Yorkshire (1230); and Simonsbath in Somersetshire. These he compares with such place-names as Robin Hood's Hills, Robin Hood's Stride, and Robin Hood's Well, in which the name of another popular hero is preserved. Concerning Simonsbath we are informed that in the eighteenth century it was the name of a single farm-house by the river Barle on Exmoor. The farm-house has now grown into a hamlet. But the name belonged originally to a pool in the Barle. Here, according to the legend, a noted outlaw, once the terror of these parts, was accustomed to bathe. 'The noted outlaw, Simon, is in all probability,' writes Dr Moorman, 'no other than the heroic Sigemund of *Beowulf* fame.' The name Simonsbath is to be regarded as an allusion to Sigemund's bath in the dragon's blood; and, as this detail is not mentioned in the *Beowulf* version of Sigemund's story, and is mentioned in the *Nibelungenlied* version of Siegfried's story, Dr Moorman would fain conclude that it was added to the myth in England. This is indeed a very ample inference from a place-name which apparently is not recorded before 1791. Between the fifth century, Sigemund's date on Dr Moorman's hypothesis, and the close of the eighteenth century many an outlaw, called Sigemund or Simon, may have haunted the wilds of Exmoor. The other Sigemund place-names given above exhibit no spellings earlier than the Middle English period. They may well be post-Conquest in origin, and commemorate perfectly unheroic Sigemunds whose names became associated with the conspicuous natural features of their holdings. In short, though several of our place-names contain the personal name, Sigemund, it seems impossible to say in any single instance that the great Sigemund is referred to. In the Norfolk place-name, Walsingham (Wælsingaham, 1046; Walsingaham, 1066), Dr Moorman sees the record of a settlement of the Burgundian Wælsings in England after the ruin of their state in the fifth century. He does not overlook the fact that according to the now accepted method of interpretation Walsingham would mean no more than the home of the sons of some unknown person called Wæls, but he argues for the historic possibility of the first-named view, and even goes the length of suggesting that this interesting colony was under the leadership of Sigemund himself, who thus steps forth from the mists of fiction on to the frontiers of history.

In the place-name Walsingham there is, we know, nothing to compel a verdict for one view or the other. The Wælsings (Völsungar of the Scandinavian saga) may have made a settlement in England, if historians will tolerate the assumption, but to suppose that the hero Sigemund led them in person is to push speculation a little too far. We have already stated our conviction that not a single English place-name can be indubitably accredited to the influence of the Sigemund legend. Nothing therefore remains for us except to assure Dr Moorman that we have read his essay very carefully, and admire the skill and persuasiveness with which he develops his argument, but that at the same time we are not induced to believe on the supposed testimony of certain English place-names that Sigemund the Wælsing established a Wælsing colony in this country, that his story was here augmented by the episode of the bath in the dragon's blood, and that, thus augmented, it made its way to the Continent, there to find ultimate incorporation in the *Nibelungenlied*.

We have discussed Dr Moorman's theories at some length, not only because, if true, they would have an important bearing on our study of Old English literature, but also because the evidence on which they rest is mainly of a technical kind calling for special examination.

In conclusion, we congratulate Professor Elton on his editorial good fortune in being able to offer to the public such an excellent sestet of essays.

C. J. Battersby.

Sheffield.

Beowulf with the Finnsburg Fragment. Edited by A. J. Wyatt. New edition revised with Introduction and Notes by R. W. Chambers. Cambridge: University Press. 1915. 8vo. xxxviii + 254 pp.

This book is a revision of Mr Wyatt's well-known edition of *Beowulf*, but the changes and additions are so extensive and important that in reality we have a new work, most competently executed.

Dr Chambers modestly tells us that he has made no 'personal emendations.' Many will regret his restraint, for he has performed his by no means easy task with such critical acumen and breadth and accuracy of learning as to make one wish he had been more adventurous in the matter of emendation.

Dr Chambers is widely and deeply read in *Beowulf* literature and his criticisms of those who have contributed to it are fresh and illuminating. Thorkelin whose translation of, and notes on, *Beowulf* perished in the bombardment of Copenhagen receives a just tribute of gratitude for his valuable transcripts. The character of Grundtvig's remarkable work could not well be better described than it is in the new editor's brief sketch. Indeed the services rendered by the different editors of *Beowulf*, from Grundtvig to Sedgefield, are here admirably appraised.

In preparing his text Dr Chambers has not been content to rely on the E. E. T. S. and other previous editions, but following the example set with such good results by Professor Sedgefield has turned to the MS. itself to see if there was still anything to glean in a field already carefully searched. The quest has been far from unprofitable.

His attitude towards the text and his reasons for not meddling with the spelling Dr Chambers clearly sets forth on pp. xxii—xxviii of his introduction. He is as conservative in regard to the MS. as Mr Wyatt and deserts it only on strong and sufficient grounds: 'In fifty places,' he says, 'I have felt compelled, mainly on metrical grounds, to desert the MS., where Mr Wyatt adhered to it. But this is balanced by the fact that in fifty-one places I undertake the defence of the MS., even where Mr Wyatt had abandoned it.'

Though the introduction as a definition of his position and methods of working is interesting and instructive, Dr Chambers would have made it more useful to students had he, like Professor Sedgefield, deserted the plan of the traditional edition of *Beowulf* and briefly dealt with the various problems of the poem. Dr Chambers' promised separate 'Introduction to the study of *Beowulf*' hardly justifies the omission.

The notes on the text are excellent: they are concise, clear and to the point, and not only contain just what the elementary student needs to help him through his difficulties, but are also calculated to stimulate the advanced student and guide him to the various works referred to. The problems are squarely faced, the various proposed solutions considered, indeed, perhaps nothing in the book shows Dr Chambers' strength to greater advantage than the fairness and insight he displays in discussing these. Though the quotations from previous editions are naturally very numerous, I have only noticed one case in which a slight injustice is done. In the note on *wæg-bora* (l. 1440) Dr Chambers might have added that Professor Sedgefield in his second edition has substituted *wave-raiser* for *piercer of the waves* which he adopted in his first.

It seems to me a defect that Dr Chambers has not made the glossary fuller; he, like Mr Wyatt, appears to think that the educative value of the edition would be reduced by 'a too elaborate glossary'; but the danger is not obvious. Surely *Beowulf* even with a complete concordance contains enough material for educative purposes. Apart from its incompleteness little fault can be found with Dr Chambers' glossary; but *unfair* is a questionable rendering of *unfæger* (l. 727).

Dr Chambers retains ȝ in the text but uses *g* in the notes and vocabulary.

The book is furnished with two facsimiles of the *Beowulf* MS., and two of Thorkelin's transcripts. It is admirably printed and, as far as we can see, is free from misprints: *ȝefrunon* (l. 2), for *ȝefrūnon*, is apparently intentional.

J. D. Jones.

Sheffield.

Studies in the Dialects of the Kentish Charters of the Old English Period. By William Frank Bryan. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company. 1915. 8vo. xiii + 40 pp.

The first section (pp. 1—9) of this dissertation examines in detail the phonology (stressed vowels and diphthongs) of 32 Kentish Charters arranged chronologically from A.D. 679 to A.D. 1044, and divided into three groups. Its practical value would have been considerably increased by the inclusion of an index.

Part II (pp. 20—28), though it is the smallest in compass of the three parts of the dissertation, raises several points in the Old Kentish dialect worth consideration. In this part, Mr Bryan determines the dialect of each charter, using the familiar criteria, with a view to estimating the influence of Anglian and West Saxon dialects. In addition, 'this study wishes to add broken *seolfa* (*siolfa*) as an Anglian form, and a strong tendency toward delabialisation of unstressed *u*(*o*) as a Kentish peculiarity.' In attributing the diphthong of *seolfa* to breaking, the argument that *seolfa* is a 'distinctively Anglian' form is destroyed. For breaking before *l* + consonant was more regular in W.S. and Kentish than in Anglian (Wright, *O.E. Grammar*, §§ 7, 49). Wright finds the forms *seolf* and *heolfor* (§ 84, note 2) 'difficult to account for,' and he also regards the diphthong *eo* as the result of breaking. Now *eo* due to guttural mutation of *e* is common in all the non-W.S. dialects. It may occur before more than one consonant (Luick, *Hist. Gram. der eng. Sprache*, 1914, § 229). Examples are: W.S. Kent. *sweostor*, O.E. *geoxa* < **geosca* < *gesca* (*s*- combinations); also North. *seolla*, *sealla* = W.S. *sellan*. With the last example I couple *seolfa* and attribute the form *seolf* to analogy. Guttural mutation similarly accounts, I take it, for the form *heolfor*. The later W.S. forms *sylf*, *silf*, like *syllic*, *syllan*, are due to the palatal quality of initial *s*. Theoretically, therefore, *seolfa* is common to Anglian and Kentish, and Mr Bryan is not justified in taking the word to be a mark of Anglian dialect.

The other characteristic of the Kentish dialect put forward is the delabialisation of unstressed *u*(*o*) to *a* as in *wiarald*, *broðar*, *earan*. Such delabialisation, I notice, is fairly regular after guttural stem vowels. Before recording it as a Kentish characteristic, however, more research is necessary. In this connection it is worth noting that in the terminations *-ode* and *-od* of Class II weak verbs, *o* predominates in W.S., and the delabialised form *a* occurs in Kentish, but chiefly in Anglian. Hence more investigation is necessary before one can fully appreciate the significance of these phenomena in the charters.

The well-ordered little dissertation is completed by an essay (pp. 29—40) on the mixed dialect of the charters studied in relation to the political and religious history of the period.

P. D. Haworth.

Bristol.

Robert Greene. By JOHN CLARK JORDAN. (*Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.*) New York: Columbia Univ. Press; London: H. Milford. 1915. 8vo. xii + 231 pp.

Were it not for the quarrel between Greene and Gabriel Harvey we should know much less about Greene than we do, but the view generally held of his life and character would probably be much nearer to the truth. In the absence of other evidence Harvey's attacks have been allowed an unreasonable weight, and many writers have made of Greene a sort of typical villain, guilty of every kind of vice and only redeemed by a picturesque tendency to fits of repentance at more or less regular intervals. It is this distorted view which renders Dr Jordan's sober and balanced account of him especially welcome. We need not claim that Greene was a model of virtue, but there seems to be no evidence at all that his morality was below the standard of his time or that he was a man with whom decent people could not associate. He died indeed miserably and—it would appear—deserted by all, but no one seems to have pointed out that the reason for this desertion is as likely to have been absence of his friends from London through fear of the plague, which at the time was daily increasing there, as indifference to Greene. We know that one of his friends at least, Thomas Nashe, was in the country.

Dr Jordan divides Greene's prose pamphlets into three groups according to the motto which he used, a method of grouping originated, I believe, by F. G. Fleay. He gives useful summaries of the plots and discusses how, and with what limits, a definite progress can be traced in his work. Separate chapters deal with the poetry, the chronology of the non-dramatic works, and with the plays. Appendices contain a tabulation of the 'framework tales,' a discussion of misconceptions regarding Greene (that he was a minister, an actor, and studying to become a physician), and a collection of early allusions to him.

The most important point in which Dr Jordan corrects the current view is with regard to Greene's repentance. He shows that this has been made to extend over too large a portion of Greene's life by treating as repentance-tracts certain pamphlets, namely the *Mourning Garment*, 1590, and *Never Too Late*, 1590, which are not in any true sense personal, but which merely use the prodigal son story as a literary motif. The real repentance tracts, namely the *Repentance of Robert Greene* and the last pages of the *Groatsworth of Wit*, the only genuinely autobiographical part of his work, belong to the period immediately before his death on Sept. 2, 1592.

Dr Jordan differs from all other accounts of Greene known to me in casting doubt on Greene's travels on the Continent. He says:

> It is interesting to note that there is in Greene's writings not a single reference (with perhaps one possible exception) which can be cited as indicating that Greene had any direct first-hand knowledge of the Continent.

The case is curiously parallel with that of Nashe, who has similarly been credited with a knowledge of foreign countries.

It has in recent times been usual to assume that the *Defence of Cony-catching*, 1592, is not by Greene, and as the pamphlet is ostensibly an attack on Greene the assumption seems at first sight an obvious one to make. It has, however, been already remarked that the hostility against Greene does not ring quite true, and it has been suggested that the work was perhaps written by a confederate or friend. Dr Jordan goes even further than this and thinks it quite possible that the pamphlet was the work of Greene himself. In view, however, of the very definite charge made in it against Greene in connection with *Orlando Furioso*, it seems to me that the evidence is against Dr Jordan's view. The charge, even if, as Dr Jordan suggests, it is untrue, is at any rate a serious one, and it seems unlikely that Greene would make it in order merely to give an air of verisimilitude to the attack.

Dr Jordan makes the interesting suggestion that a passage in the *Defence* may be an intermediate link in the Greene-Harvey-Nashe quarrel. In this there is an allusion to one of Greene's 'poetical brethren,' a 'learned hypocrite'

> 'that could brooke no abuses in the Commonwealth, was so zealous that he began to put an English she Saint in the Legend, for the holinesse of her life: and forgot not so much as her dogge, as Tobies was remembred, that wagged tayle at the sight of his olde Mistresse.'

Then follows a scandalous tale about this person's wooing.

I do not think, however, that Dr Jordan has proved that there is any reference to the Harveys here, and there is surely another person who fits in better with the indications given, namely Philip Stubbes, some of whose earlier work is in verse and in such verse that the association of him with Greene would be far from complimentary to the latter. The phrase about brooking no abuses would then refer to Stubbes' *Anatomy of Abuses*, the putting of an English she saint in the Legend to his *Crystal Glass for Christian Women*, 1591, in praise of the 'godly life and Christian death' of his wife Catherine—whose 'little Puppie, or Bitch (which in her life time she loved well)' is mentioned (p. 202 of Furnival's ed. of the *Anatomy*, Part 1). We may also note that in the tale which follows, the initial of the hero's Christian name is given as P, and his father is said to dwell in Cheshire. It will be remembered that in the *Almond for a Parrot*, it is stated that Stubbes 'in his minority plaide the Reader in Chesshire.'

A few other points in Dr Jordan's work may be noticed.

P. 12, note 6. The interpretation of Rich's statement that five of the tales in his *Farewell to Military Profession* were 'forged only for delight' as meaning that he himself was the author of them seems open to question. Does Rich mean more than that they are not founded on fact?

P. 35, note 31. *Tatic* should be *Tatio*.

Pp. 54, 57 and 59. Gnaepheus is usually spelled Gnapheus.

P. 55. The words '*of Stymmelius*' are wrongly italicised, as if part of a title.

Pp. 119–20. In discussing the *Disputation between a He and a She Cony-catcher*, Dr Jordan refers to the story which it contains of the

conversion of a courtezan by a young man who, taking her into a very dark room, reminds her that even there God can see her. Greene professes that the incident related is true and recent, and Dr Jordan states that the source of the story is not known. It will, however, be found in the *Colloquia* of Erasmus at the beginning of the dialogue 'Adolescentis et Scorti.'

P. 173. 'The earliest known edition [of the *Groatsworth of Wit*] is 1596.' The edition of 1592 is now in the British Museum.

P. 186. In discussing the authorship of *Selimus* it would have been fairer to make some mention of Charles Crawford's work on the subject. Whether his views are accepted or not, most of the arguments rest on parallels pointed out by him.

We have to thank Dr Jordan for what, taken as a whole, is an excellent piece of work. While he has perhaps not much that is altogether new to say, he certainly presents a view of Greene which is more correct in many points than that of the majority of text-books. There remains indeed matter for the investigation of future scholars, more particularly as regards Greene's sources, his method of work and his originality or the want of it, but so long as there exists no more accessible reprint of Greene's prose works than that of Grosart, such minute enquiries would be perhaps of doubtful value.

R. B. McKerrow.

London.

The Exemplum in the early Religious and Didactic Literature of England. By Joseph Albert Mosher. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1911. 8vo. xi + 150 pp.

The literary kind which is the subject of this study is paramountly religious and ecclesiastical in its origin and connexions; but that is no impeachment to its character as a branch of what Tennyson, in his *Timbuctoo*, called 'the great vine of Fable.' Long before the folk of Palestine listened to the parables of Christ, India had heard Sendebar's stories of the Seven Wise Masters and the Fables of Bidpai. Aristophanes informs us in the *Wasps* that, if you wanted to secure the vote of an Athenian dicast, you told him something humorous from the collection which passed under the name of Æsop then, and for more than two thousand years afterwards. Indeed it needs small imagination to see that the serious and the amusing purpose have been intertwined from an earlier date in human history than we have literary record of. Of tales intended to enforce a lesson, Jotham's parable to the Shechemites and Nathan's to David are the earliest that occur to the present writer; but doubtless India, China and Egypt could point to cases far older, and perhaps make good their point. Nor is it necessary to suppose those of one country derived as a matter of course from those of another. Fabling and fables may have originated independently in many quarters of the earth, even as, according to Milton (*P. L.* ix, 76—86), did the animals who so often form their subject.

Dr Mosher, after considering seven definitions of the exemplum, holds that fables and matter of natural history are properly to be excluded from a kind, the essentials of which he marks as (1) a brief narrative, (2) human characters; though, since in fact fables are *not* excluded by mediæval collectors and preachers, he allows us 'incidental consideration' of them. He amplifies the idea of the exemplum by stating six purposes served by it; the first of which practically includes most of the others—'to furnish a concrete illustration of the result of obeying or disobeying some religious or moral law.' The sphere of the exemplum is, then, distinctly religious, though its subject-matter may be and often is secular; and it owes its introduction into that sphere to clerical perception that human patience with didactics is not inexhaustible, nor human ability in presenting them beyond the need of assistance.

The early Fathers of the Church made no great use of this aid. His exclusion of fables or bestiary-matter excuses the author from any allusion to the Alexandrian *Physiologus*; and even the Latin Fathers relied far more on the strained symbolism familiar to readers of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis* than on tales of any kind. Allegory is thus of earlier birth or vogue than the exemplum, though in mediæval work it takes its place as part of the exemplum machinery. Still Jerome, Augustine, and Bæda in England indulged their readers, if not their auditors, with an occasional story; and tales of theirs were perpetuated by recognized exponents of the type, which finds its true initiation towards the end of the sixth century in the *Dialogues* and the *Homilies* of Gregory the Great. Those in the *Pastoral Care* were introduced to England by Alfred's translation; those in the *Dialogues* by Bishop Werferth's: and Alfred's *Boethius* stamped this illustrative practice with his approval by its expansion of those he found in that author.

The history detailed in Dr Mosher's study is in effect a history of mediæval preaching on one of its sides. It is sermons that we are mainly concerned with, and collections of tales as ancillary to sermons, though the record widens later to include religious treatises and even educational books like *Stans Puer ad Mensam*. In the sphere of preaching we may trace two periods of florescence for the exemplum. In the first, the Old English, the flower is not abundant. The period includes the *Blickling Homilies*, perhaps before the middle of the tenth century; Ælfric's, 991–996; those of Wulfstan, archbishop of York from 1002–1023; and the twelfth-century *Old English Homilies* edited by Morris. Of these the chief representative of the exemplum is Ælfric, who has more non-Biblical than Biblical tales; while Wulfstan and the writers who pass under his name reverse the proportion, and the *Old English Homilies* confine themselves to a few Biblical narratives without secular tales at all. The early opposition of allegory and exempla is kept up by a return in the last-named to the symbolic exposition of the early Church. This decay in the use of exempla coincides with a decay in preaching itself. By the end of the eleventh century, still more later, the zeal, humanity and literary taste of Ælfric have given place to the

indifference of Norman prelates, lovers of sport and pleasure: the Sunday lacks observance: sermons in 1200 are rarely heard (pp. 45 *n.*, 49—50). The totally uninspired and unoriginal *Ormulum* represents the standard of religious teaching, and the interdict of John's reign goes far to put an end to religious worship of any kind.

Meantime the causes are at work which are to produce the second or genuine period of florescence. Religious life may languish, but the life of courts goes on, and the literary instinct still ministers to its entertainment. The twelfth century had already produced, whether in England or abroad, the miscellanies of John of Salisbury and Walter Map, *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*, taking toll of classical literature and history as well as of the Bible and the stories current in ever increasing number in monastic circles. The *Otia Imperialia* of Gervase of Tilbury was written about 1211 to amuse Otho IV. This, and still more the great compendium *De Naturis Rerum* of Alexander Neckham about the end of the twelfth century, are remarkable for their appeal to natural history, or what the Middle Age inherited as such from the ancient world. In less degree the *Old English Homilies* had evinced a similar interest half a century before. The *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, 1196–9, of Giraldus Cambrensis is a fifth collection, occupied indeed with purely ecclesiastical matters, but making far fuller use of illustrative tales, many of them quite incredible to modern ears. Innocent III thought so highly of it that he resisted all importunities to lend his copy; a circumstance which, with its contents and professed aim at the spiritual welfare of Gerald's Welsh compatriots, constitutes it, in effect at least, a real example-book for later sermon uses; a character we can hardly give to its predecessors of more varied and secular purpose. A sixth name is that of Odo of Sheriton, preacher as well as writer (pp. 66—72), who collected fables and tales, 1219–21, and reintroduced the exemplum in his sermons before that date. He uses the old sources, Jerome's *Vitæ Patrum*, Gregory's *Dialogues*, etc.; but two-thirds of his tales are of monkish origin, and he draws upon the bestiaries. Indeed this interest in Nature, especially animated, whether its evidences fall strictly within the *genre* of the exemplum or not, is one of the most obvious facts of mediæval life, and still retains its vigour in imaginative literature. It is seen in the beast-epic of Reynard in all its branches: it is seen in the animal-symbols of Merlin's prophecy as reported by Geoffrey of Monmouth and carried down through a long line of similar prophecies: it is seen in Neckham's book and Odo's Fables and the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* of Bartholomæus Anglicus (c. 1230–50); in the stories found in sermons here discussed; in Chaucer, Lydgate and Henryson. And Lyly's riot in this material, as Spenser's *Kalendar* and *Mother Hubberds Tale*, do but hand on the taste to Milton in his 7th Book, and to Dryden's *Hind and Panther*; and, quickened by La Fontaine, to L'Estrange's moralized *Fables* and those of Gay; thence to tender-hearted Cowper and Burns, Wordsworth's dogs, Scott's stag-hunt, Leigh Hunt's *Man and Fish*, the animal-tales, German or English, that charmed our childhood, *The Cat's*

Pilgrimage and *At a Railway Siding* of Froude, *The Stone Age* of Mr H. G. Wells, till it prompts the English reception of Maeterlinck's *Blue Bird.*

All the six mediæval collections mentioned above are in Latin: though all by Englishmen, they are not all certainly composed in England; and, though they abound in exempla, they are not primarily or professedly example-books compiled for clerical use. But their actual effect in inducing the restoration of the exemplum admits them, quite properly, to Dr Mosher's account, which of course glances at the Crusades as helping to swell the volume of material with the great store of Eastern fable. It is late in the thirteenth century (p. 75) before collections expressly designed as example-books are made in England. The instances cited are the *Liber Exemplorum*, 1270–9, the *Speculum Laicorum*, c. 1275, the *Gesta Romanorum*, c. 1300—most famous of all, the *Liber de Moralizationibus* and *Liber Sapientiæ* of John Holkot who died in 1349, and, last and largest, John Bromyard's *Summa Prædicantium*, c. 1400.

Long ere this the coming of the Friars (Dominicans in Aug. 1221, Franciscans Sept. 1224) had revived preaching in England, and the vast material thus gathered comes gradually into use. Odo of Sheriton, we saw, used exempla or 'parabolæ' in his sermons shortly before their arrival; but the friars' preaching was a new thing, animated by a new zeal, using new methods. They dethroned law and logic, the scholastic predilection, from its place in the sermon; substituting a living appeal to feelings kindled by the story of Christ's doings upon earth, and to an attention kept awake by applications to daily life and by racy anecdotes. They preached very often in English, and extempore: hence few of their sermons are preserved before the middle of the century, and for some time after it only Dominican collections, still in Latin (p. 87), which, however, show much use of stories, and sometimes include a *promptuarium* or appendix of such. The list of sources is swollen about 1270–90 by the famous *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine, archbishop of Genoa after this, consisting of stories of saints meant for church use and actually so used. Similar English collections are the *South English Legendary* (end of thirteenth century) and *Cursor Mundi* c. 1326; while early in the fourteenth century comes the *North English Homily Collection* in verse, the sermons of which were also read in church. Dr Mosher's grouping of fifty-five of its exempla (pp. 95–7) shows a very large proportion from the *Legenda Aurea* or other lives of saints, and only seven from the Bible. The *Contes Moralizés* of Nicole de Bozon (aft. 1320) return once more to the properties of minerals, plants and animals. Brief discussion is followed by moralization (first attached to fables by Odo of Sheriton, p. 66), and that often by a story; the whole being directed to the practical aspects of religion, and, from the form, evidently intended as notes for sermon-use. The maximum use of exempla in actual homilies is reached in the *Festial* of the Shropshire canon, Mirk—a series of seventy-four sermons for the Sundays and Saints-days of the year.

To detail the minor varieties in the form of the exemplum's use would be as tedious as to follow our author's diligence in tracing the sources of all these writers. The general marks of the type, as visible in the *North English Homilies* or the *Festial*, are stated by him as follows:

(1) The tales were ordinarily striking, often lurid or indelicate; (2) they were rarely taken from the Bible, but represented a vast range of sources, religious and secular; (3) tales about churchmen outnumbered all other kinds; (4) they were not mere references, but incidents with a beginning, middle and end; (5) exempla were not excluded from the body of the sermon or treatise, but the favorite place was at the close, where from one to five usually appeared; (6) conventional introductory and closing phrases very often set off the exemplum; (7) in a great many instances the source of the narrative was given; e.g. 'We read in the Dialogues,' or 'Cesarius tells of a hermit' (p. 33).

The appearance of nearly all these marks as early as Ælfric confirms the author's statements that the exemplum was 'revived without changing its essential form' (p. 20), and that 'there was no general evolution' (p. 138). The book, in fact, is not a history of changes in the form, but of its varying popularity. Nor, though many preachers, Mirk among them, did their best to infuse local colour and incident, can we claim for the exemplum any specially English character.

Anything like distinct national features in religious literature was practically impossible under an organization so universal and all-powerful as the mediæval Church (p. 112).

The fifth and practically last chapter shows us the exemplum in religious treatises and even in popular education-books. Of the former, which resemble sermons, the *Handlyng Synne*, 1303, is signalized as far the most literary and vivacious, its hardy aim aspiring to nothing less than the seduction to paths of virtue of Glotoun and his companions at the ale. Of such works the maximum use of exempla is detected in *Jacob's Well* of the early fifteenth century. In earlier specimens such as *Vices and Virtues*, c. 1200, *Sawle Warde* a little later, and the *Abbey of the Holy Ghost* of the mid-fourteenth century, the exemplum is almost absent, while on the other hand there is a considerable allegorical element. Their inclusion here seems due to the fact that in *Jacob's Well* the two elements, exemplum and allegory, are 'combined' (p. 126). Perhaps 'juxtaposed' would be a better word, for the methods of narrative and allegory are distinct, and, strictly speaking, admit of no fusion. Langland's fable of the 'ratones' accords but ill with its surroundings, and his realistic Deadly Sins are no abstract personifications but, in fact, vivid exempla. Juxtaposition, not combination, occurs whenever the exemplum includes a formal moralization or religious application; as in the *Gesta*, where at one stroke authority, civil or ecclesiastical, is fortified, and the romantic imagination licensed, by the ever-recurring formula—'Beloved, the Emperor,—the Soldan, the king, the magistrate—is God.'

But these religious treatises, if little to the purpose of the exemplum, are, we think, otherwise significant. Intended as they were to promote church discipline, and especially to keep the flock informed on Creed and

Commandments, on the doctrine of the Sacraments, on the Seven Deadly Sins and the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer; and using, as they do, allegorical personification, they fulfil essentially the same function as the Moral Plays, and suggest a natural original for the latter at a time when the clergy were beginning to deplore the growing secularity of the Miracles in the hands of the guilds.

The same kind of protest sounds the knell of the exemplum itself, and at about the same date. The vicious narratives of clerical error which our discreet author spares us—narratives which a friar's humour could not resist, and which an earlier standard of manners, or a Roman Catholic order for the deadly Seven, might partly excuse—roused at length due protest from Wiclif and the Lollards, and soon from Councils of the Church (p. 18). Mirk's *Festial*, indeed, and the *Summa Prædicantium*, followed, and successfully ignored, the earliest of these; but by the fifteenth century the tide of the exemplum has turned. After the Reformation it becomes, not regular, but sporadic. To-day it finds its best field in the missionary sermon. Its total disappearance is neither probable nor desirable.

Meantime, in the fourteenth century it has conducted us to Gower and Chaucer. The latter, though he uses beast-matter from the Reinart epic in his Cock and Fox, writes without reference to the type here studied. Moral Gower, in that *Miroir de l'Omme* which was expanded later into the *Confessio Amantis*, consciously adapts the exemplum form to inculcate his code of earthly love (pp. 124–6). If he sinned thereby, and secured any of that material advantage which sin, since her migration to this planet, sometimes holds in her gift, he has paid forfeit since. With unwrung withers Dr Mosher may congratulate himself on the completion of a careful, orderly and well-indexed progress over a course which, in its faithful repetition of familiar signs and figures, may perhaps remind him of the first hundred miles of any great trunk-line from London, or possibly from New York. The journey has, no doubt, been undertaken by others before these hoardings became so obvious: but his Great Northern, Midland or Great Eastern have hitherto lacked a traveller willing to ignore for them, as he so largely must, the less mechanical beauties of the landscape. Nor is his patience thrown away on a study which, besides fulfilling its actual purpose, gives us some suggestive hints alike for the *Divina Commedia* and that other, distinguished by De Sanctis as the 'Commedia Umana,' of Boccaccio.

R. Warwick Bond.

Nottingham.

The Ballade. By Helen Louise Cohen. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1915. 8vo. xix + 397 pp.

Miss Cohen's treatise on the *ballade* in France and in England (including Scotland) may truly be said to exhaust the topic she has chosen for her particular enquiry. It is sound and scholarly, and

'documenté,' as the French would say, almost to a fault. It might with advantage have been less objective; as Miss Cohen probably knows as much about the *ballade* as any other person, we should have liked to have had her own opinion, as well as that of the various authorities she quotes so lavishly, on at least some of the difficult problems raised in the course of her investigations. With this reservation, which really applies to any extent only to the critical part of the work, we have nothing but praise for Miss Cohen's book.

Chapter I (pp. 1—46) deals with the origin of the *ballade*, and sets forth in detail the views held by E. Stengel, A. Jeanroy and R. M. Meyer on that question, but does not in any way help us to make a choice. Possibly Miss Cohen felt that, as practically nothing remains of that primitive Romance literature which has become a postulate of critics, it is wiser not to be too assertive. In any case she gives us a very clear explanation of the early *ballettes* and *ballades*; of the transitional type of *ballade*, as seen in the poems of Jehannot de l'Escureul († 1303) and in certain *romans* such as the *Dit de la Panthère* and the *Regret Guillaume*; and also shows that the last important contribution to the structure of the *ballade* such as we know it was the envoy, which was added in the *puys* in the late fourteenth century.

Chapter II (pp. 47—153) is devoted to the *ballade* in France from the end of the fourteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth century. In these pages Miss Cohen, who incidentally gives proof of a very wide knowledge of Middle and of Modern French literature generally, has not set herself the impossible task of discussing the *ballade* output of all the writers of that type of poem in the period indicated; she has preferred, quite rightly I think, to attempt an account of its most significant phases, and to draw up a survey of French *ballade* literature, grouped, as far as possible, according to subjects. Here again no flaw can be found in Miss Cohen's equipment, except perhaps that it is a little misleading (p. 93, note) to call Octovien de Saint-Gelays (whom Miss Cohen, like most people, persists in calling Octavien) one of the poetic followers of Villon.

Chapter III (pp. 154—221) contains a bibliography of the handbooks of poetics which deal with the theory of the *ballade*, from Deschamps to Boileau, as well as long illustrative extracts, principally from the earlier of these treatises. The whole of this chapter is a useful compilation, which however could with advantage have been cut down considerably; there does not appear to be much point in giving lengthy extracts from the early *arts de rhétorique* now that they are so easily accessible in E. Langlois' *Recueil d'Arts de Seconde Rhétorique* (Paris, 1902), and elsewhere. In this connection it may be pointed out that F. Gaiffe's edition of Sibilet's *Art Poétique has* appeared (it was issued in 1910, in the series of the 'Société des textes français modernes'), and that there is an excellent critical edition of the *Art Poétique* of Pierre de Laudun Daigaliers by Joseph Dedieu (Toulouse, 1909). Alongside the well-known passages from du Bellay's *Deffence*, Pasquier's *Recherches*, and Vauquelin de la Fresnaye's *Art Poétique*, in which the

ballade is contemptuously rejected, might have been placed the less hackneyed references in the same vein from *La Manière de faire des vers en françois comme en grec et en latin* (1573) of Jacques de la Taille (p. 14 of the original edition), and from the *Contes et discours d'Eutrapel* of Noël du Fail (ed. Hippeau, I, p. 251).

Chapter IV (pp. 222—299) deals with the Middle English *ballade*, and with the *ballade* in Scotland. After reading Miss Cohen's careful account of the *ballades* of Chaucer, of Lydgate, of Hoccleve, of the collection of Quixley, and of the series that for many years was attributed to Charles d'Orléans, we are forced to the conclusion that the French *ballade* never obtained a proper hold in Middle English. Consequently Professor F. M. Padelford's statement in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (vol. II, chap. xvi, p. 390) to the effect that 'of all forms of French amatory verse, the ballade enjoyed the greatest popularity in England' must be cancelled, though possibly a few additional specimens, still unprinted, may yet be unearthed. *A propos* of the collection of *ballades* which for many years went under the name of Charles d'Orléans, it is hardly correct to say, as Miss Cohen does (p. 267), that 'critical opinion on the subject of the authorship of these ballades had not advanced beyond the critic of the *Retrospective Review*, when MacCracken assigned these translations to William de la Pole, first Duke of Suffolk.' G. Bullrich's thesis (Berlin, 1893), which Miss Cohen quotes on p. 275, and the more recent work of P. Sauerstein (*Charles d'Orléans und die englische Übersetzung seiner Dichtungen*, Halle, 1899), though not very illuminating, helped to keep the problem alive, and are certainly much superior to the anonymous critic of the *Retrospective Review* of 1827. As for the three specimens of Middle Scots *ballades*, two are doubtful (especially the three-stanza poem from Douglas's *Palice of Honour*), and only one exhibits the conventional structure. The fact is that the Middle Scots 'makaris' were still less fond of the *ballade* than their English predecessors and contemporaries, and I do not think that the quest which Miss Cohen proposes to undertake in the various Scottish libraries is likely to be very fruitful.

Chapter V (pp. 300—339) traces the revival of the *ballade*, after an eclipse of a hundred and fifty years or more, thanks to the efforts of Théodore de Banville, that prince of poetic jugglers, whose example called forth imitators, immediately in his own country and a few years later (in the last part of the decade 1870–1880) in England, where the *ballade* found favour almost simultaneously with Austin Dobson, Edmund Gosse, Andrew Lang, Swinburne and Henley. Stevenson's sympathetic studies of Charles d'Orléans and of François Villon also certainly helped the movement by directing attention to the older French poets who had excelled in the fixed forms. It would appear, according to Mr Gosse, that Rossetti's translation of Villon's 'Ballade of Dead Ladies' was accidental, in the sense that Rossetti was attracted to the beauty of the old French poem without having perceived the character or the possibilities of the form.

Miss Cohen's treatise concludes with three appendices and copious

bibliographies. The first appendix consists of a few unpublished French *ballades* from MS. Douce 379; the third deals briefly with the *chant-royal*, a kind of elaborate and grandiose *ballade* addressed generally to a king or a divinity; the second with the *serventois*, which in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was the name given to a *chant-royal* without an envoy especially designed to exalt the Virgin Mary, and thus having no connection with the O.F. poems with the same name.

It may be said in conclusion that Miss Cohen's admirable study of the *ballade* completely replaces F. J. A. Davidson's German thesis on the same subject (*Über den Ursprung und die Geschichte der französischen Ballade*, Halle, 1900), not to speak of G. Hecq's *La Ballade et ses dérivés* (Bruxelles, 1891), which has no value. It does great credit to the university of which she is so distinguished a student, and all those interested in these fascinating mediaeval French metrical forms will await with impatience any further contribution from so competent a scholar.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

The Rise of Classical English Criticism. A History of the Canons of English Literary Taste and Rhetorical Doctrines, from the beginnings of English Criticism to the death of Dryden. By JAMES ROUTH. New Orleans: Tulane University Press. 1915. 8vo. 101 pp.

In the preface, Mr Routh points out the failings of all preceding writers on classical criticism: Saintsbury gives us 'incoherent and nebulous masses of material'; Miss Wylie's book 'suffers from the same defect'; the Oxford series 'from a similar haziness of purpose'; Gregory Smith's introduction is praised for the moment so that many of his notes may with more seeming impartiality be labelled 'errors' or 'worthless examples'; Spingarn is 'sketchy'; Bohn 'biographical'; Bebertag 'literary'; Klein 'narrow in scope'; Friedland and Tieje 'limited' in subject. Mr Routh finds that all these scholars have failed 'through fallacy of definition.' And so he himself ventures to frame a definition—'the science of criticism is the same as the science of rhetoric in its largest sense; and the history of criticism is the history of rhetorical principles as they have changed from century to century, and grown in changing.'

Whether this definition is more satisfactory or more helpful as a guide to the historian of criticism than the ones we may imagine to have been held by the erring historians castigated above, will not concern us here. Our complaint is that Mr Routh does not apply it to his own study. He specifically rejects the purely historic for the absolute judgment: 'wholly exploded theories,' whatever their historic weight, are apparently to be omitted (p. 98), Dryden is repeatedly twitted with 'jumbling subtle truth with absurdity' (p. 18) and 'flat contradictions' (p. 56), and Sidney is arraigned for 'very erratic bits of logic' (p. 47); Mr Routh further deals only with those rhetorical

principles 'which are to us of vital import,' 'which have proved their fitness by surviving,' and still further, he bars out those which are mere platitudes. So, he halts between a history of criticism and a critical evaluation of certain points of literary theory. And so the choice of the rhetorical principles dealt with is at best unhistoric, and generally quite fortuitous.

In his six chapters, headed 'Rule of Law,' 'Purpose of Literary Art,' 'Types of Literature,' 'Material suitable for Literature,' 'Style,' 'Verse Technique,' Mr Routh collects a mass of *dicta* in a purely arbitrary and unmethodical order on a number of important and unimportant points of classical literary theory. For instance chapter IV ('Material suitable for Literature') deals successively, at length and in brief, with these topics; Unsuitability of Political material, Imitative material, Novelty in material, Bookish mannerisms, Learning in Art, the Ugly, Action on the Stage, Verisimilitude, Personal Experience in poetic material, the Supernatural, the Mythological, Fiction, Probability, Scientific Impersonality, Realism and Idealism, Choice of Characters, Doctrine of Characters, Infusion of lightly satiric malice, Function of Satire: while chapter V is even more baffling. This is to give an entirely false view of Classical criticism, which, more than all other types, was a complete and ordered theory, constructed in all its ramifications on fundamental and clearly related principles, so that every single detail of the theory had a definite place and importance in the full scheme. But of discrimination in these principles and details, Mr Routh has no clear conception. He presents Classical criticism, not as a theory, but as a disconnected array of details, details, moreover, presented without either historic or absolute proportion.

He could have saved himself if he had gone to the source of Classical criticism; not, however, in a spirit of pedantic 'Quellenforschung,' but for general enlightenment. His discussion in general 'deliberately ignores sources' as a matter 'extraneous here, however important in itself.' He has no first-hand knowledge of the Italian critics, he never mentions them in the text. But the result does not justify the neglect. It seems to us impossible to write a *history* of English Classical criticism without considering Italian and French criticism: at all events, we have here one more concrete instance of failure in the attempt. For the conception of the Art of Poetry as a full theory and the proportionate relation of the details of the Art, would have been obtained by Mr Routh as they were obtained by our Classical critics themselves, from the French and especially from the Italian critics. And so his book would not have been a mere string of critical *dicta*, but an organised survey of their meaning, relation and importance. We feel bound to add that the value Mr Routh's book might have had as a collection of these *dicta* is almost annulled by his failure to supply an Index.

We have noticed the following misprints: p. 5 note 2 omitted, p. 21 *ofter* for *after*, p. 40 *Wiliam*, p. 42 *itailcs*, p. 75 *writers* for *unities*.

H. B. Charlton.

Manchester.

The Works of Henry Vaughan. Edited by LEONARD CYRIL MARTIN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. 2 Vols. (with continuous pagination). 8vo. xvi + 715 pp.

In this excellent edition of the prose and verse works of the Silurist, Mr Martin gives us a text based on a collation of the texts of the early issues, with variants and modern emendations recorded in footnotes. He adds Notes at the end of volume II (it might perhaps have been more convenient if the notes to volume I had been included in that volume) in which he attempts to trace Vaughan's indebtedness to his predecessors, wisely neglecting the many cases in which he has himself been reflected in later writers. That the quotations when recognised as such have been traced to their sources, may be taken for granted when one hears that Mr Martin was assisted in this part of his work by Professor Bensly of Aberystwith. On the whole then we have what will long remain the student's edition of Vaughan.

I add a few notes on points of detail.

p. 3.

> When the sad tumults of the Maze,
> Arrests, suites, and the dreadful face
> Of Seargeants are not seene.

Mr Martin writes: 'I think it likely that Vaughan wrote "Mace" as the rhyme suggests, in the sense of a mace-bearer.' This is plausible, but I think, wrong. (1) The bad rime presents no difficulty. Vaughan has scores of cases where a *z*-sound rimes with an *s*, *e.g.* on two succeeding pages (623, 624) 'gaze': 'face[1].' (2) The sense is better if we take 'Maze' to be the giddy whirl of life, rather than 'the mace-bearer,' which would merely anticipate 'Seargeants' that follows. (3) Tubbe in paraphrasing this poem uses 'Maze' (though not in this connexion):

> such a Maze
> Of Joyes & Pleasure[2].

p. 6. 'To his Friend being in Love.' This is clearly suggested by Suckling's song, 'Why so pale and wan, fond lover?'

p. 11, ll. 47—58. *The Rhapsodis*, one of the most interesting of Vaughan's poems, needed some further elucidation. Vaughan's spirit, as shown in the toast to Caligula for making his horse a senator, is clearly anti-Parliamentarian. But who is the living man whom he toasts as Cæsar

> that like fire broke out
> Into the Senate's face?

And who the dead man whom he toasts as Sylla? Are they Charles and Strafford?

[1] Perhaps Vaughan's Welsh origin has something to do with this. Compare his fondness for the plurals 'leafs,' 'lifes.' I have found six cases of 'leafs' against one of 'leaves' (used to rime with 'heaves').

[2] *Henry Tubbe* (Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, v), p. 66.

It is curious that a few lines lower he seems to scoff at those who sent their plate 'to strangers,' considering that so many colleges had sent their plate to the King.

p. 37.

> Hath there not rev'rence bin
> Pay'd to the *Beard* at doore, for *Lord* within?

Mr Martin suggests 'Board' for 'Beard,' I hardly know in what sense. Cannot 'Beard' refer to the old porter?

p. 40.

> No *sullen heats* nor *flames* that are
> *Offensive* and *Canicular*,
> Shine on thy *Sands*.

Mr Martin mentions Mr Chambers' suggestion that these lines are based on some attributed to Dr Donne:

> Nor roast in fiery eyes, which always are Canicular.

But is it necessary to go beyond Horace's praise of the spring of Bandusia:

> Te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculæ
> Nescit tangere?

p. 55, l. 36.

> Thou doest but *Kill*, and *Circumvent* in *Jest*.

Is there an allusion to *Hamlet* II, 3. 244?

p. 248, l. 32. A reference should have been given to Horace, *Carm.* IV, iv, 57.

p. 507.

> the sheep-keeping *Syrian* maid.

Not Rebekah, but Rachel, her niece (*Genesis* xxix, 9—17).

p. 518, ll. 21, 22. An allusion to the proverb 'Asinus mysteria portans' (Erasmus, *Adagia* 2204).

p. 539. 'The Queer,' *i.e.*, I suppose, 'The Quære.'

p. 619, ll. 47, 48.

> close restraint and awe
> (Which is the Maiden, Tyrant law).

The second line seems unintelligible as it stands. Query, 'to Maiden'?

p. 621, ll. 13, 14.

> do what thou canst to hide
> A bad trees fruit will be describ'd.

The rime requires 'descried,' a favourite word of Vaughan's.

p. 626. 'In Etesiam lachrymantem.'

> Dicite Chaldæi! quæ me fortuna fatigat,
> Cum formosa dies et sine nube perit?

A textual note shows that 'perit' is a modern emendation. The original edition of 1678 has 'peruit,' which an early hand corrected to 'periit.'

Mr Martin writes: 'I think it probable that Vaughan wrote "periit," which explains the misprint better than the more metrically correct "perit."'

It seems to me clear that Vaughan wrote 'pluit.' The rain from a clear sky was the portent which the Chaldæans had to interpret. The 'l' after the 'p' must have been taken as a contraction for 'er' and so produced the form 'peruit.'

p. 648. 'Jordanis.' Vaughan's Latin verse leaves much to desire. In l. 2 perhaps 'serit' should be 'ferit' ('æthra' being the acc. = 'æthera'). In l. 5 'nil cærula librem' is an Anglicism: 'I would weigh not (='reck not of,' 'envy not') the sea.' In l. 10 'Libata' has a deponent sense.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Berkeley and Percival. By Benjamin Rand. The Correspondence of George Berkeley, afterwards Bishop of Cloyne, and Sir John Percival, afterwards Earl of Egmont. Cambridge: University Press. 1914. 8vo. x + 302 pp.

The existence and general character of the correspondence between Berkeley and Percival is known to students from the references to it and extracts from it in Campbell Fraser's accounts of Berkeley's life and work. Unfortunately, Campbell Fraser's standard of exactitude was not high, and it is now evident that what purported to be transcriptions of letters were often only his own summaries, in which the original phraseology was condensed or expanded and the order of passages was altered in a most arbitrary manner. It is, therefore, interesting and useful to have before us at last the complete series of letters, extending over the years 1709 to 1733, to which Dr Rand has judiciously added a few other letters from the Egmont collection which bear upon Berkeley's life, and some extracts from Percival's journal for the years 1741–46. To the whole he has prefixed a biographical commentary in preference to adding explanatory footnotes to the Correspondence itself. This Commentary is well and carefully composed, though it is not entirely free from blemish. Mr G. A. Johnston has shown good reason for supposing Dr Rand mistaken in referring to Samuel Clarke Berkeley's mention on March 1, 1710, of a letter to Mr Clarke in which he asked for the latter's 'thoughts on the subject of God's existence' (*Mind*, N.S. No. 94, p. 266); and there are some minor points as to which doubts might be raised concerning Dr Rand's interpretation. For instance, Dr Rand says that Berkeley declares Sacheverell to be a character of whom he 'is not at all fond.' Berkeley does indeed confess that he has 'a very moderate esteem' of 'the sermons and conduct of the Dr,' but in the sentence to which reference is made what he says is: 'I am told this involuntary act of mine' [drinking Sacheverell's health in a coffee-house at the instance

of a tipsy man] 'is like to gain me the reputation of being a great admirer of Dr Sacheverell's, which is a character I am not at all fond of.' The sentence is, perhaps, ambiguous, but it seems more naturally rendered as meaning that Berkeley is not fond of being taken for one of Sacheverell's admirers.

The Commentary does in the main give what is necessary for the explanation of the correspondence. There is, however, a considerable number of incidental references in the letters which are, no doubt, of no great importance, but which might well have been briefly elucidated in footnotes. In one or two places such notes might have assured us of the accuracy of the transcription. For example, in his letter of July 29, 1710, Berkeley asks Percival to procure the opinion upon his 'New Principles' of some of his 'ingenious acquaintances who are thinking men and addicted to the study of rational philosophy and mathematics.' Here Campbell Fraser read 'natural' for 'rational,' and his mistake, if it was a mistake, was worth noting. On April 16, 1713, Berkeley gives an account of the reception of Addison's *Cato* at its first performance, and mentions that some parts of Pope's Prologue were hissed; but, he adds (according to Campbell Fraser), 'the clap got much the better of the hiss.' Dr Rand's transcription omits the words 'the better of,' and the sentence, if accurately given, is nonsensical and needs explanation. The references to 'a very bold and pernicious book entitled "A Discourse on Free Thinking"' (by Anthony Collins) on p. 105 and to 'a clergyman from Wiltshire' (Arthur Collier) on p. 118 should have been annotated, and the names of Collins and Collier should have been given in the Index. On p. 285 a note would have made clear whether Dean (afterwards Bishop) Osbaldeston's appearance in the text as Dr Orbaldeston is Percival's error or the editor's. The name appears again as Orbaldeston in the Index with a false reference to p. 286.

Campbell Fraser, despite his inaccuracy in detail, extracted from the letters the gist of all that is most important for the knowledge of Berkeley's life, and the full text is interesting less for any new information to be found in it than for the light it throws on Berkeley's character. It is at first a little surprising to us that he should have been regarded by his contemporaries with the strong feelings of affection and esteem that are focussed in the verdict of Pope's famous line. He had wit in plenty, it is true, but otherwise one might think that he was born out of due time. He did not affect to be unaffected, but was really so. He never posed. His gaiety was perfectly simple; his charity and deep religious conviction were perfectly genuine, and they were neither unduly flaunted nor timorously concealed. His romantic enthusiasm was combined with energy that gave it untiring and (what is more rare) undeviating practical expression. On the other hand, his practical judgment was extravagant, being always uncritically biased by hope. One of the best things in this volume is Byrd's letter to Percival written from Virginia and commenting on Berkeley's Bermuda scheme: the project, he fears, is 'poetical,' and 'the Dean is as much

a Don Quixote in zeal, as that renowned knight was in chivalry.' To be accounted Quixotic was not generally a recommendation in that age, and yet Berkeley's name was universally honoured by his contemporaries (except, of course, the politicians) no less than it is, as we gladly learn from the Editor, by Americans to-day. He who reads these letters will understand the reason.

T. Loveday.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

The Dialect of the New Forest in Hampshire (as spoken in the village of Burley). By Sir James Wilson. Oxford: University Press. [1914.] 8vo. 48 pp. (Publications of the Philological Society.)

Lowland Scotch as spoken in the Lower Strathearn District of Perthshire. By the same author. Oxford: University Press. 1915. 8vo. 276 pp.

These two books have good stuff in them. The account of the Strathearn dialect is specially welcome for its rich store of words and racy conversational phrases. These we may accept as 'the real thing,' seeing that Sir James Wilson is himself a Strathearn man and has been at pains to confirm every detail by consulting some of the oldest natives (whose portrait is considerately given), reputed to speak the dialect in its purest form. The little study of the speech of Burley is based, we are told, on materials collected during two short visits to the village. Good as these two books are, they would, we think, have been more valuable if they had been made on strictly scientific lines. As the Scottish branch of the English Association is engaged in collecting materials for a new Scotch dictionary, which will give a complete account of all the dialects now spoken in the Lowlands, it might be hoped that careful attention would be given to recording local pronunciation with the utmost precision, and that phonetic notation would be employed. In his 'foreword' to Sir James Wilson's larger work Professor Craigie distinguishes between the 'broad' and the 'narrow' way of dealing with dialects and says Sir James Wilson has chosen the former way. We should prefer to say he has followed the amateur's way. Good work has been done in the past by amateurs, but the worst of it is that sooner or later it has all to be done over again by the specialist, and in no branch of knowledge is this more patent than in English philology—the home-made article, that is. Sir James Wilson seems to be aware that dialect study is now a serious study; he mentions such authorities as Professor Joseph Wright and the late Sir James Murray. But his analysis of sounds is imperfect, and instead of using a recognised system of phonetic representation he prefers one of his own, though he certainly does give in his Introduction its equivalent in the symbols used by the 'International System.' There is no attempt made to investigate the origin of the sounds, and the grammatical arrangement

quite ignores the organic structure of the dialect and its development from earlier stages. In these respects Brilioth's *Grammar of the Dialect of Lorton* (also published by the Philological Society) is far superior, and might well have served as a model to Sir James Wilson. Could not the Philological Society secure uniformity of method in the studies of dialects which it publishes? In his Introduction Sir James Wilson has an interesting note on the process by which Strathearn attracts and assimilates adjacent Celtic speakers. The most incontrovertible statement in the book is that 'a Scotch accent is not a bad thing for a man to have, anywhere in the wide world.' Unfortunately the accent cannot be learnt from written symbols.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

MANCHESTER.

The Holiness of Pascal. By H. F. STEWART. Hulsean Lecture, 1914–15. Cambridge: University Press. 1915. 8vo. ix + 145 pp. (Lectures, 96, Notes, 49).

As an introduction to the study of Pascal these lectures, with their scholarly notes, should prove useful. From the title one would indeed have expected rather the biography of a Soul than a sketch of a busy life occupied chiefly with science and controversy. Through the brief lectures, packed full of facts, the spiritual experiences of the Mystic flit in and out like shy spectres, surprised to find themselves intruding into secular affairs. The most recent authorities come beneath the lecturer's eye, and as he is careful to give chapter and verse for what he says, the notes are of abiding value. He has not, it is true, gone far afield, perhaps the limits of time and space were too stringent, but what he gives is good, and his judgment is as sound as his method is scientific.

Blaise Pascal appears on the scene as a precocious boy of fourteen, when his parents had already joined the Jansenist party, and in its austere if somewhat narrow creed, he was brought up. But Jansenism, with its harsh Augustinian theology, was not the paramount influence of his early and most receptive years. In 1637 appeared Descartes' *Discours de la Méthode*, which probably about this time became known to Pascal's father and his literary and scientific circle. The book at once raised a violent controversy, for it assailed the foundation of Scholasticism, and with it, the whole of Scholastic Theology. The *Méthode* was a trumpet call to the world, and like the rams' horns that brought down the walls of Jericho it laid bare the whole citadel of orthodoxy. Truth, Descartes declared, did not rest, as Realism had thought, in general ideas inferred from mere words, nor (as prevailing Nominalism taught) in sense-perception, supplemented, where sense failed, by revelation and authority. The one criterion of truth, Descartes maintained, was that the idea of it, intuitively perceived by the reason, should be 'clear and distinct.' The *Méthode* showed how such truth could be discovered, and in the use of this new instrument young Pascal

was reared. From Jansenism he derived his life-long devotion to duty, and his clear perception of moral ideas, from Cartesianism his habit of clear thinking. Mr Stewart strangely overlooks Pascal's indebtedness to the Cartesian Philosophy, possibly because some of his authorities have misunderstood Pascal's saying, that the whole of it was not worth an hour's trouble. But the philosophy he meant was the only one that bore the name in his day, that of Aristotle and of the schoolmen. To this he was utterly opposed. How deeply ingrained was his Cartesianism is evident from such passages as this in which the main principles of the new philosophy are briefly summarised: 'Je sens que je peux n'avoir point été, car le *moi* consiste dans ma pensée; donc moi qui pense n'aurais pas été, si ma mère eût été tuée avant que j'eusse été animé. Donc je ne suis pas un être nécessaire. Je ne suis pas aussi éternel, ni infini; mais je vois bien qu'il y a dans la nature un être nécessaire, éternel, infini.'

Jansenism as a doctrinal system was merely a particular form of Scholasticism, a fact realised with increasing distinctness by Pascal in the process of controversy. When first he took up arms it was in defence rather of his friends than of their theology, because he knew they were being attacked by an unscrupulous coalition of Jesuits and reactionaries, who had nothing in common but their hatred for a dangerous rival; and in the first of the Provincial Letters he satisfied his keen sense of justice by exposing this hypocritical compact. The Jansenists wanted him to follow on with a defence of their own particular doctrines of grace, but with excellent good sense he turned aside, in the letters that followed, to an exposure of the lax morality permitted to their converts by the Jesuit casuists in Spain and Flanders. If he was unfair, as Voltaire alleges, in assuming that the toleration of practices by a small minority of extremists expressed the mind of the whole society, it cannot be denied that the teaching of these men was not disowned, nor can it be admitted that the writers he attacked were all obscure, for Escobar has been reprinted many times, and is still one of their standard authorities.

Controversy, however, did not hold him long. He was by nature a Mystic, and his search for truth made him discard the trammels of sectarian dogma. He would not deny to all mankind that mercy which he had himself experienced. Truth forbade it, and thus even his Cartesian philosophy contributed to his growth in holiness.

Whatever view we take of this, no one can deny that his passionate love of the whole truth, and nothing but the truth gave to his prose style that simplicity and directness which are its peculiar charm, and made it a model for his countrymen. If French is pre-eminently the language of science and philosophy, it is because Pascal freed its prose from meretricious ornament, archaisms, long and involved sentences, inversions, classical imitations, and pedantry. The style of Descartes is simple and direct enough, but there is no denying that it is also flat and rather meagre. Pascal's genius gave to his own writing life, grace, and flexibility. Perhaps no literature owes more to a single author than

French to him. Romantic writers may claim or feel regret for the loss of ripe old crusted words and quaint symbols, put out of fashion by him, and may look back 'with fond affection and recollection' to the prose of Amyot and Montaigne, but even the best of them owe much of their grace and charm to the model of simple diction and phrase set by this consummate master.

E. A. Wesley.

Liverpool.

The Paradise of Dante Alighieri, an Experiment in Literal Verse Translation. By Charles Lancelot Shadwell. With an Introduction by John William Mackail. London: Macmillan. 1915. 8vo. xxxix + 509 pp.

It is twenty-four years since Dr Shadwell published his translation of Cantos I–XXVII of the *Purgatorio*, with an Introduction by Walter Pater. In the preface he explained the reasons which led him to adopt the metre of Marvell's *Horatian Ode on Cromwell's Return from Ireland* (1650). The ode is divided into quatrains:

> 'Tis time to leave the books in dust,
> And oil the unused armour's rust,
> Removing from the wall
> The corselet of the hall.

Now Dante's verse is characterized not only by the triple rhyme but also by the division into stanzas, each of which is as a rule complete in itself, or which are so joined that the pause comes always at the end and not in the middle of a stanza. There are thirty-three syllables in Dante's terzina and twenty-eight in one of Marvell's quatrains, but many English words are short and the sense can be expressed without undue compression. The translation of *Purgatorio* XXVII–XXXIII (The Earthly Paradise) appeared in 1899 and this volume completes the work.

The difficulty of translating poetry into another language has never been put more plainly than by Dante himself (*Convito* I, 7): 'Sappia ciascuno che nulla cosa per legame musaico armonizzata si può della sua loquela in altra trasmutare senza rompere tutta sua dolcezza e armonia.' None the less the ambition to produce a worthy version and delight in the work have allured one after another of those who have felt the spell and charm of the poet to make the attempt. There have been several translations into *terza rima* and one of these by the late Dr Plumptre has great merits; but the metre, though most effective in Italian, is not English and never quite successful. Browning used it in *The Statue and the Bust* and one wishes that he had translated some part at least of the *Commedia*. Cary and Longfellow both made use of blank verse and, fine though their translations are, the effect is heavy and unrelieved. Dr Shadwell's version has plainly been a labour of love carried on through many years. It maintains a high level of careful work. The

original, which follows Dr Moore's revised text, is printed on the opposite page and any obscurities in the version can be resolved by reference to the Italian.

The Introduction by Dr Mackail adds much to the value of the book. For the interpretation of Dante there is need for a poet's sympathy and a mystic's insight, rather than for great learning in the voluminous literature which has gathered round the *Commedia.* The *Paradiso* rises above the *Purgatorio* like the supreme beauty of a snow peak shining in the dawn above the shadowed slopes of the lower hills. In it Dante is not describing an unknown and unreal world, but setting forth in symbolic form that which has been here on earth the highest and most intense experience of the saints. Augustine, Bernard, Richard of S. Victor had ascended thither and the way was open. Exile and wanderer, eating the salt bread of a patron's charity, Dante could still pass upward to the celestial temple whose walls are light and love and share the fellowship of the blessed. At the present time hearts are anxious and sad. Much that seemed fair and strong is crumbling around us. Dante will help us to shake off the incubus of a crude materialism, to be foursquare to all the blows of fortune, and to discern and grasp the great eternal realities which transfuse and interpenetrate the shifting shows of time.

JOHN T. MITCHELL.

WAVERTREE.

The Soliloquy in German Drama. By ERWIN W. ROESSLER. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1915. 8vo. 121 pp.

A great deal of industry has gone to the making of this book, which contains a survey of German dramatic literature in its chief periods and representatives from the single point of view of the soliloquy. That this review is, during a great part of its course, somewhat monotonous, is perhaps rather to be ascribed to the peculiar task which the author has undertaken than to his treatment of that subject.

At the end of his Introduction the author leads us to expect a criticism of the realistic technique. 'Although principally a historical study, the investigation will attempt to throw light on the question whether the recent drama has, or has not, gained in artistic effectiveness by its gradual disuse of the soliloquy.' Probably many readers of the volume will turn with most interest to the part dealing with the attack upon the monologue and the methods employed by its opponents to dispense with its aid.

The author might indeed have well excused himself by his title from essaying such a task, in so far as a history of the soliloquy may be held to be concerned with its employment and not with its disuse. As

a matter of fact, however, he boldly raises the thorny question—only to weaken his work by the inadequacy of his treatment of it. The book contains 80 pages dealing with the epochs when the soliloquy was more or less frankly taken for granted and only 9 pages on 'Recent Developments,' i.e. the 'modern German realistic drama'—which here means a very little Hauptmann and even less Sudermann. Yet all the same he feels justified in commencing his four-page 'Conclusion' as follows: 'Has the recent drama gained in artistic effectiveness by its disuse of the soliloquy?,' and in concluding the whole book with the following sentence: 'It is to be hoped that the dramatic authors of to-day and to-morrow will realize that the elimination of the soliloquy of thought and feeling is a loss to the drama and that their restoration will increase its artistic effectiveness.' If the whole work had been a thorough and well-balanced elaboration of this theme, resting upon a comparison of the theory and practice of the realists with the actual achievements of their predecessors, the result might have been an extremely interesting work. As it stands, the author's 'conclusion' would give a somewhat misleading impression of the scope of the work as a whole.

What value the book possesses lies in the painstaking investigations of its central part, and a more valuable and more apt 'Conclusion' would have been one in which the results of the studies there involved were summarised. The author does indeed attempt a differentiation between the various types of soliloquy. The psychology of the soliloquy is treated in a few pages of the Introduction, which consist however mainly of brief quotations from various authorities. The 'aside' is not formally included in the subject, but it pops in and out of the picture in somewhat arbitrary fashion, being at times mentioned along with the soliloquy, while at others the soliloquies of a play are alone examined. If the whole had been subordinated to some general design, or if the author had confined himself, in the case of fresh instances, to those which showed some original features or some forward movement, the work would have gained greatly in interest and concentration.

The presentation is on the whole clear and fresh. Here and there we find a very modern touch, as when we read, on p. 24, that in the Shrovetide Plays of the fifteenth century throngs of masked citizens entered 'inns and bar-rooms' and departed 'after being wined and dined.'

H. Gibson Atkins.

London.

The Tale of the Armament of Igor. Edited by Leonard A. Magnus. Oxford: University Press. 1915. 8vo. lxiii + 123 pp.

The publication of this book is in a sense inaugural of the serious study of the Russian language and literature in this country. It is a sign that we are emerging from the 'method' or 'manual' stage into the

region of scholarship. The endowment of Russian studies at our universities might well in the future bring valuable results to the nation, as it would go far to convince educated Russians that our friendship for their country was based on something more than the political convenience of the moment.

The *Slovo*, or song, which relates the foray of Igor son of Svyatoslav against the heathen Pólovtsy in the year 1185, is one of the most remarkable and the most beautiful in the literatures of the Slavonic races. In the early vernacular poetry of Western Europe there is nothing quite comparable with it, but curiously enough, as we read it we are reminded of MacPherson's *Ossian*, in its mystery, its invocations and especially its enlistment of the forms and powers of nature to heighten terror and pathos. The event celebrated in the *Slovo* had no great significance; it was just one of the numberless raids between the Russians and their nomad foes, but the manner of telling raises it to rare poetry. Mr Magnus calls the song 'almost a broadsheet, which was also a work of genius.' The poet strictly follows the contemporary Chronicle for his facts, but his setting for them is his own, and is unique. Mr Magnus thinks he must have been an eye-witness of the events he sings, but for this he gives no good reasons, nor do we agree with him that the poet may have been associated with the production of the Chronicles, if the only grounds for this probability are that he often repeats the expressions used in the Chronicles. Apart from the charm of its style the *Slovo* has a fascination for the scholar by reason of the numerous problems it presents, among others, the question of the personality of its author, its pagan tone and its allusions to mysterious personages of Slavonic mythology. Much has been written about these matters, but they remain very puzzling.

In his Introduction, after giving the history of the unique sixteenth century MS., which was brought to light in 1795, published in 1800 and destroyed in the fire of Moscow in 1812, Mr Magnus supplies a brief summary of early Russian political geography and history, and a translation in full of the Chronicle for the year 1185, 'to put the text into historical perspective.' There are sections on metre, grammar, style, authorship, pagan survivals and a few other matters. The treatment of metre is disappointingly brief and not very clear; the editor seems indeed to fight shy of it, judging by this naïve remark: 'To analyse the metre in full would betray me into a discussion, too long for this introduction; and I rather doubt whether it would be profitable, either to truth, or the advancement of the subject. The few hints given in this section are all derived from Korš (Korsh); for the rest the reader had far better trust his own ear, and the richness of this three-beat measure will ring out.' One statement by the editor is quite erroneous: 'The regularity of the alliteration approximates the metre to that of the old German poems.' As a matter of fact, alliteration is quite exceptional in the Russian poem, and is obviously unintentional. Very little space is allotted to the language of the poem, perhaps because it differs hardly at all from that of the contemporary Chronicles,

being Church Slavonic in process of change into, or rather replacement by Russian. We agree with Mr Magnus, as against Vyazemski and Petrushevitsh, that there is no convincing evidence of Greek influence on the form of the poem, still less of any adaptation from classical models.

The text is based on the copy of the unique MS. made for Catherine II, variants from the printed edition being given in footnotes. The editor has himself in numerous cases emended the text, which is frequently corrupt, and some of his emendations, based on knowledge of the peculiarities of early Russian MSS., are ingenious if not convincing. A literal translation into English faces the Russian text, which, we may here mention, might well have been in larger type. The notes, in the preparation of which Mr Magnus acknowledges his debt to previous editors, discuss and attempt to clear up the many difficulties presented by the text and they show independence and soberness of judgment. At the same time we think the alphabetical order in which they are arranged is a mistake, as time is lost in hunting up details while going through the text. There is a small, somewhat useful map of early Russia, while the complete genealogies of early dynasties are of value for understanding the intricacies of its history. The chief faults we have to find with this useful edition are concerned with externals rather than with essentials. In the first place, there are far too many misprints which have been left uncorrected, and the punctuation is often faulty. Obscurity thus caused is increased by misuse of the English language; thus 'obsecrate' is used for 'execrate' (p. 11), 'founder' for 'plunge' (p. 11), 'cataclasmic' for 'cataclysmic' (p. viii), 'adjectional' for 'adjectival' (p. 58), 'suppositious' for 'supposititious' (p. ii), 'precessors' for 'predecessors' (p. ix), 'enclitic' for 'proclitic' (p. xxxix), 'appraised' for 'praised' (p. xxvi). Words such as 'virilize' (p. viii), 'factual' (p. xlviii), 'sploshy' (p. iv), and others seem to indicate unfamiliarity with ordinary literary English. On p. 8 'villein' is used wrongly for ратай, a king's retainer who holds land by military service. In the translation we have noticed but few errors, among which are 'extended' instead of 'bent,' 'concentrated' for стягну (l. 32); 'now' instead of 'lo, behold' for се; 'declined' instead of 'are past' for минула (l. 210); 'early moon' instead of 'early dawn' for зараніа (l. 250); 'swift-footed' ('hungry' is suggested in the notes!) instead of 'bare-footed,' i.e. pad-footed, unshod, stealthy, for босымъ (l. 685). We have no space to correct even a few of the misprints. We welcome Mr Magnus's book, and hope it may ere long require a second edition.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

THE TEXT OF 'PIERS PLOWMAN': CRITICAL METHODS.

I. DR KNOTT'S ESSAY.

'An Essay toward the critical text of the A-version of *Piers the Plowman*,' by Dr T. A. Knott, will be found in Vol. XII of *Modern Philology*. In this essay—packed full of diligent research—Dr Knott publishes the results of work begun in 1907, and planned even earlier, in 1905, when Professor Manly and he 'recognized the need for an adequate critical text.'

As these dates show, and as we pointed out[1] after publishing, seven years ago, some of the preliminary results of our collations[2], the credit of having been first to plan the collation of all MSS. of the A-text goes to Dr Knott. That this hard labour should have been done twice over, is not so great a waste of time as it seems, since it is useful to have independent workers whose results correct or confirm each other.

We think anyone who minutely compares Dr Knott's paper with ours will find that Dr Knott's results agree, more closely than he seems willing to admit, with those which we published in 1909.

The main object of our paper of 1909 was to show that the Vernon MS. (which had been regarded as the best MS. of the A-text, and upon which Skeat had based his edition) did not possess the value attributed to it. We thought the Vernon text ought not to be used in the way it was being used, in discussing the authorship of *Piers Plowman*, and that a more critical text was needed as a basis for argument. We gave reasons for preferring the MS. at Trinity College, Cambridge, and used it as the basis of our collations[3].

Dr Knott likewise rejects Vernon, and selects Trinity as his basis. It is a great thing gained if it can now be taken as agreed that Vernon

[1] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, v, 1910, p. 25.
[2] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, iv, 1909, pp. 357–89.
[3] The inferiority of the Vernon text of *Ypotis* provides an interesting parallel. This text had been considered the best, but Miss Sutton has just shown strong reasons to the contrary. See her important paper in *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.*, 1916, p. 114.

does not fairly represent the A-text. Many hundreds of erroneous readings, due to Vernon, can be finally dismissed from the recognised text; and any deductions based upon the supposed accuracy of those erroneous readings fall to the ground.

It is perhaps rather a pity that Dr Knott did not think it necessary to state that on this essential point his results agreed with ours. It is not that here any acknowledgement was due to us: Dr Knott, we know, arrived at this result quite independently. But if readers are to follow intelligently so complicated a subject as this, it is at least as important to indicate the broad lines of agreement as the points of difference. The definite conclusions (apart from tentative suggestions) at which we arrived in 1909, we summed up under four heads[1]: Dr Knott puts forward views which are either absolutely or substantially in agreement[2] with all these, whilst he also puts forward other views from which we differ; but as no reference is ever made to the points of agreement, the appearance of difference is exaggerated.

The points of difference Dr Knott indicates clearly enough. We have read his essay with something of the feelings with which Mr Pickwick heard his character revealed by Serjeant Buzfuz. We do not in all details classify the fourteen A-MSS. as does Dr Knott. Herein Dr Knott sees proof of the 'essential unsoundness[3]' of our text, and of our 'faulty method[4]' and insufficient examination of MSS.[5] Without investigating other possible reasons for difference, Dr Knott assumes that if he dissents from our view as to the source of a certain reading it is because of our 'loose thinking or loose phrasing[6].'

Yet a more pacific scholar would have realized that, even granting sound thinking on both sides, differences are likely to occur in MS. classification; because one MS. will often show quite contradictory and inconsistent traces of relationship. How inconsistent such traces may be, is shown by the MS. recently acquired by the National Library of Wales (Aberystwyth). In its earlier passus this is an A-text with constant C-interpolations.

Dr Knott appears to have overlooked this Aberystwyth MS. No blame attaches to him: it has hitherto been overlooked, we think, by

[1] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 383–4.

[2] For (1) cf. Dr Knott on p. 410; (4) on p. 389; (2) on pp. 409–10; but here Dr Knott would, we take it, only agree with our second clause in a sense different from that which we intended. Our third conclusion was that the apparent divergencies between the received A-text and the received B-text are in many cases not true divergencies, but are due to scribal 'sophistications' adopted into the received A-text from the Vernon MS. On this cf. Dr Knott on p. 392 (quoted, in part, below; see p. 266).

[3] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 415.

[4] p. 411. [5] p. 414. [6] p. 413.

all writers on the text of *Piers Plowman*. The MS. is chiefly interesting as an additional example of the composite character of texts. An A-MS. may be contaminated with B or C influence, or it may be a combination of two distinct A-families. It may belong in the main to one family with transient hints of belonging to another: this often happened because a MS. had been transcribed from an original, which itself had been corrected from a MS. of another type.

Dr Knott himself points out how some of the A-texts illustrate this process:

> Sometimes the possessor of a MS. compared it with another copy of the same work, and, noticing differences between the two copies, scratched out the words of one MS. and substituted those of the other, or added lines not in his MS. We have a great many cases of this in MSS. H and H_2, and sporadic cases of it in a number of other MSS. of the A-text. A later copy of a MS. which has thus been 'corrected' would naturally reproduce only the 'revised' readings, and the modern text editor would perhaps encounter considerable difficulty in placing such a contaminated MS. in his tree[1].

We had preached the same sermon on the same text. Dr Knott never quotes us except to differ, so, to make it clear when we are in agreement with him, we are compelled, here and elsewhere, to quote ourselves:

> It [H_2] has had corrections written in by a later hand. These corrections seem to have been made on no very clearly intelligible principle. Three or four of them, however, could only have been made by a man who was familiar with the earlier passus of the poem in the B or C version. Had H_2 been copied again, we should have had in the copy a characteristic A-text of the T-type with a few puzzling and sporadic B-readings[2].

Now this 'mixture' was a constant feature of mediaeval transcription. It follows that it is a very difficult thing to determine exactly the relationship of MSS. A MS. often contains readings derived from so many different sources that it cannot be regarded as belonging to any one family. It may in this way become worthless: just as an eye-witness of a certain event might have listened to other persons' accounts of the same scene, till he became confused as to what he had actually seen and what he had heard from others. This might go so far that his evidence ceased to have independent value. And so it frequently happens with MSS. In our paper of seven years ago we dismissed two MSS.—Ashmole and Harleian 3954—as too corrupt and too much adulterated with B- or C-influence to have much value[3]: and the same applied in great measure to Digby and Westminster[4], and to Dublin[5].

[1] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 416.
[2] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 375.
[3] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 383.
[4] pp. 375–6, 379.
[5] p. 376.

Dr Knott has carefully examined even the more corrupt and composite MSS. It is a thankless task, for it may well be doubted whether they are not at least as likely to mislead as to help us. But every student must be grateful for the painstaking thoroughness with which Dr Knott has examined *all* MSS. known to him, however corrupted and composite they might be. The Dublin MS. Dr Knott concludes to be even more composite than we thought.

In the light of the work we too have been doing during the past seven years, we think that, much as we in 1909 emphasized the composite character of the MSS., we did not do so sufficiently—and that Dr Knott, even now, does not allow sufficiently for it. It must follow, from this complexity, that it is not enough, in order to prove that a given MS. belongs to a given group, to cite, as Dr Knott does, features which it possesses in common with that group. It is necessary to make sure that there are not also other features, which would lead us to connect it with an entirely different group. And this Dr Knott very frequently omits to do. This seems to us to render many of his conclusions invalid, whilst we acknowledge the value of the statistics he has compiled.

He is, for example, very angry with us because we did not definitely group the Douce MS., as he does, with the sub-group TH_2 (Trinity and Harleian 6041). For he has found variants which Douce shares with these two MSS. So had we, and we pointed out in 1909 that 'in many cases it [Douce] goes with TH_2[1].' But if Dr Knott had gone a step further, and enquired into the affinities of the Douce MS. with the rival sub-group RU (Rawlinson and University), he would have seen why it is necessary to be cautious. He would have seen how the variants tending in the direction for which he argues are neutralized by a second class of variants[2] (which he ignores) tending in the exactly opposite direction. He would also have noticed how the scribe of the Douce MS. has in one case combined the readings of the two sub-groups together[3], and in another has begun to give the reading of the one sub-group, then himself crossed it out, and given the reading of the other[4].

[1] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 379.

[2] E.g. Pro. 72: II, 64: IV, 51, 120–21, and so on: minor examples, Pro. 31, etc. Skeat's numbering is followed.

[3] II, 56. For similar proof of 'mixture,' cf. Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 1881, pp. 93–107.

[4] VII, 179.

We cannot, therefore, allot the Douce MS. exclusively to the one or the other sub-group. Its scribe was in touch with *both* the tradition represented by the sub-group TH_2 *and* that represented by the sub-group RU. To bring forward one half of the evidence and close the matter there, is the fallacy of Lady Mede in the B-text, when she quoted the Biblical dictum about bribery giving success, but suppressed the second half about its ruining the soul[1].

Dr Knott must, when collating the Douce MS., have overlooked this second class of readings. If he wishes to satisfy himself of their significance, our photograph of the MS. is at his disposal.

Precisely the same applies to our differences as to the affinities of other MSS. But there is a further cause for differences of opinion. Readings not only have to be counted on both sides, instead of on one side only: they have further to be weighed.

The evidence that MSS. are connected, lies in their possessing errors in common, of a character not likely to be due to mere coincidence. Dr Knott says, quite rightly: 'It needs to be especially emphasized that the common possession of the *correct* reading by several MSS. is no proof at all that these MSS. are members of a group[2].' This is obvious: two witnesses may tell the same truth, and yet be independent: it is when they agree upon a fabrication that we argue that they have been in communication, or draw from a common source.

The weight, then, of an apparently inferior reading, as evidence of connection between the MSS. which share it, varies in proportion as we can be *quite certain* that it is erroneous.

The importance of this appears when we consider the position of the Ingilby MS. (I). We had concluded that T and U belonged to one and the same family, in virtue of distinctly inferior readings which they possessed in common, varying from readings quite certainly erroneous to readings only presumably so[3]. Now Ingilby shares half of these *prima facie* inferior readings. But on scrutiny it appears that this half consists of none of the really conclusive ones, but exactly of those which are least certainly erroneous. For that reason we were inclined to be cautious[4]. Readings, like MSS., 'must be weighed, as well as counted.'

Yet this (as it seems to us) quite virtuous circumspection moves

[1] B-text, III, 332.
[2] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 394.
[3] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 371–3. Cf. Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 1881, p. 33.
[4] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 383.

Dr Knott to his most bitter invective against Chambers and Grattan. He complains that they dismiss six cases as inconclusive:

> Then they say 'the five remaining cases are not very conclusive either.' So that just one half of their 'inferior' readings seem inconclusively inferior when Chambers and Grattan wish to be rid of them[1].

By such conduct, Dr Knott urges, Chambers and Grattan 'practically destroy whatever confidence one has left in their judgment[1].'

Now so far from wishing 'to be rid of' these inferior readings, what Chambers and Grattan *really* said was:

> The five remaining cases are not very conclusive either; *but they serve to suggest the possibility of some slight connection between I and the TU group*[2].

Dr Knott quotes the first half of this sentence and entirely suppresses the words which we have italicized.

Yet Dr Knott himself does not claim that the connection is other than a remote one: he only claims to have found nine readings to support it in the more than seventeen hundred lines which he has examined; whilst other relationships, such as that between V and H, are supported, on Dr Knott's own showing, by 150 readings or more.

Further, these nine instances have to be scrutinized. Two of them Dr Knott himself relegates to a footnote, presumably because he regards them as inconclusive: in point of fact most of the remaining seven are also highly inconclusive.

Further, the danger of building much upon so small a number of readings is emphasized by the fact that the Ingilby MS. possesses several undoubted and striking errors in common with the opposite group (VH), though both Dr Knott and ourselves are quite agreed that it does not belong to *that* group[3].

Dr Knott, then, has brought forward no claim that the connection for which he argues is other than a very slight one: and we ourselves in the second half of our sentence (which Dr Knott suppresses) suggested the possibility of some slight connection. Upon what, then, does all this rather absurd pother about Dr Knott's difference with Chambers and Grattan depend?

Dr Knott's case, like Lady Mede's, depends upon suppressing the second half (and that the essential half) of a sentence.

There are many other misunderstandings in the six pages which

[1] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 413. [2] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 383.

[3] The most striking are I, 105 and VII, 180–1. To the last of these Dr Knott himself refers (p. 392) though in another connection.

Dr Knott devotes to us, but only one calls for discussion, an essential question of critical method being involved.

Dr Knott points out how: 'By their own admission Chambers and Grattan seriously disturb one's confidence in their ability to distinguish between inferior and superior readings[1]': we first find readings to be inferior, and then, subsequently, find that in some cases these inferior readings, being supported by the weight of MS. authority, are not really inferior after all.

But Dr Knott omits to point out that the inferiority first admitted was a purely intrinsic, *a priori*, inferiority (all consideration of MS. authority being for the moment excluded) and that we expressly stated that:

> The results will, of course, be quite provisional, for subsequently MS. authority may—and indeed will—lead us to think that in some cases what we have condemned as the inferior reading must be the actual words of the original writer, and that what we have regarded as the better reading is only the felicitous corruption of an isolated scribe. But we cannot invoke MS. authority yet: we have still to decide where it lies[2].

This is the method recommended by Moore[3], and by Westcott and Hort[4]. Strangely enough, Dr Knott appeals to Moore, and to Westcott and Hort, as the expositors of right critical principles. Such they undoubtedly are. Then why does it 'disturb his confidence' to see their principles put in practice?

Faced by a large number of MSS., how are we to start upon estimating their value and relationship? The process recommended by Moore[3], and by Westcott and Hort[4] is this:

We select the passages where one reading seems, on various grounds of *intrinsic* probability, superior to another or others. We then notice in which MSS. the inferior readings occur, and so obtain data to judge the worth and relationship of MSS. Having done this we can, for the first time, begin to speak of MS. authority, and of one MS. being better than another. But, as we decide where the weight of MS. authority lies, we must look back, and be prepared to alter our original judgement as to readings if, as Moore says, 'very strong *a posteriori* evidence from the best MSS. should seem to overbalance the admittedly inconclusive *a priori* evidence[3].'

The three stages are repeatedly[4] emphasized by Westcott and Hort: first, *provisional* judgement of readings on intrinsic evidence: then, estimate of MS. authority by these readings: then, final decision.

[1] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 412.
[2] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 372.
[3] *Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia*, p. XXXV.
[4] *Introduction*, 1881, p. 33; *N. T.*, 1885, p. 546.

What is there here to 'disturb the confidence' of Dr Knott? We cannot use MS. authority in the first, provisional, judgement, because we are collecting material to enable us to estimate that MS. authority, and 'to warp our choice by assuming as proved the general conclusion for which we are collecting material is, in the full sense of the term, preposterous[1].'

Or (admitting the advisability of reconsideration) is it because so many as six cases out of twenty-two are dismissed, on reconsideration, that Dr Knott's confidence is so seriously disturbed?

We must remember that we are dealing with two sets of MSS., one of which ultimately turns out to be very greatly superior to the other. Now in cases of this kind, even where the better tradition gives us a *prima facie* inferior reading, such inferiority will often not stand scrutiny. Such, at least, is the experience of Westcott and Hort: 'The instances of this kind which are ultimately found to stand scrutiny are always much fewer than a critic's first impression leads him to suppose[2].' It stands to reason that it will be so: that the number of readings which we are still confident to be erroneous, *after* we have discovered that the document or collection of documents which supports them is emphatically the better one, will be only a portion of the number which at first sight we believed to be inferior, when we as yet had no means of deciding whether the document supporting them was better or worse.

So far, then, as Dr Knott's attack on us goes, it needs reconsideration in view of these principles: (1) Readings must be counted on all sides, not on one only, (2) They must be weighed as well as counted, (3) They, and the conclusions drawn from them, must be revised, as a knowledge of MS. authority and relationship is acquired, enabling us to reconsider our first data.

Here then, considering that we are closely engaged on war-work, we may perhaps be allowed to leave Dr Knott's attack on us, and turn to his treatment of the late Professor Skeat.

II. Dr Knott and Skeat's Edition.

The 'older method of printing a text' Dr Knott characterizes as 'unscientific and unreliable,' and he contrasts it with the 'critical method' which he advocates, of making a complete family tree of all the MSS. Now the only older editor of the A-text is Skeat, and

[1] *Juvenal*, ed. Housman, pp. xiv, xv. [2] *Introduction*, 1881, p. 34.

Skeat, we admit, did not make a complete family tree of all the MSS. But we shall try to show that his method was not therefore 'unscientific' or 'unreliable.'

Dr Knott's attitude to Skeat's work may be gathered from the fact that, when he has to compare Skeat's edition with the edition which he himself is preparing, he speaks, not of Skeat's edition as compared with 'my forthcoming edition,' but of Skeat's edition as compared with 'the Critical Text[1].'

It is true that in the reprint of his paper as a Doctoral Dissertation, Dr Knott alludes to the debt we are all under to Skeat for his 'labors in locating the MSS. long ago.' But this is a ludicrous understatement. Skeat's labours in locating the MSS. are as nothing compared with his labours in editing three of them, with collations of some twenty others, and specimens of all.

So far as the A-text goes, Skeat gave an accurate reprint of a fairly good MS. (which he had every reason at that time to regard as the best MS.)—the Vernon—with collations of others, the best forthcoming at the time, and correction of such of Vernon's blunders as he considered seriously to interfere with the sense, *and of such only*. Skeat's text, therefore, formed an adequate basis for further work, but was not, and did not profess to be, a final text.

When allotting us the task of a new edition for the Early English Text Society, Skeat expressed a hope that we would make clear the position of his A-text. We did not do so at any length in our previous article, because it seemed to us that no one could fail to see the excellence of Skeat's work, and how all subsequent work must be based upon it. It was not for us, as Dr Johnson would have said, to bandy civilities with our master. But now that Skeat is dead, and that Dr Knott has stigmatized the 'older method of printing a text' as 'unscientific and unreliable,' it is necessary to speak more at length.

Without special mention of Skeat, Dr Knott defines this 'older method of printing a text' in order to contrast it with the 'critical method' which he advocates:

> The older method of printing a text was to select an old, well-spelled, well-written MS., the readings of which seemed to the editor to give 'the best sense.' In case of dissatisfaction with a reading, support for it was looked for in other MSS., and, if support failed, a reading was adopted from some other MS. or MSS., which the editor thought gave the 'best sense[2].'

Now we do not deny that this is true enough of Skeat's A-text. Skeat certainly selected the Vernon MS. (V) as his basis because it was

[1] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 390.

[2] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 392.

old, well written, and its readings seemed to give the best sense. He says so himself[1]. Whenever he could, Skeat followed V, emending only 'where it seemed to need it[2].' Even when dissatisfied with a reading of V, he frequently retained it, if he could find support for it in V's nearest relative H (Harleian 875). 'I let it stand,' he says, 'because H agrees with V, and my object is to avoid alteration as much as possible[3].'

Further we readily admit that this 'older method,' as Dr Knott calls it, *did* lead to the introduction into the text of many false readings. 'The editor,' says Dr Knott, 'left in his text a large number of readings which gave "good smooth sense" but some of which were sophisticated, that is, introduced by copyists who were practising conjectural emendation[4].' This is, indeed, the danger of following Vernon. We gave in our previous paper four pages of examples where the scribe of Vernon or his original had, as we said, 'sophisticated the passage[5].'

Again, according to Dr Knott, this method led to the introduction into the editor's text of readings which were 'intelligible, but which could not be supported by scientific proof[6].' These readings were due not so much to the deliberate sophistication of the scribe, as to his careless substitution of one word or phrase for another. Here again we agree that Skeat's close following of the Vernon MS. led to the retention in his text of many such readings. Indeed, in our previous paper we gave another four pages of examples of such readings from Skeat's A-text[7].

We are, then, quite in agreement with Dr Knott as to the lines upon which a new edition may be expected to improve upon Skeat's edition. Where we differ from Dr Knott is in his claim for the 'critical method.'

Dr Knott seems to regard this method as one which will save the editor from himself. The editor who followed the 'older method,' says Dr Knott, 'often adopted readings merely according to his whim or his

[1] 'This MS. [the Vernon] was taken for the text, not solely because it is the oldest and best written, but also because...its readings are on the whole better than those of any other.' *Preface, Text A*, p. xvi. 'The Vernon MS. was chosen for the A-text because it seemed, upon the whole, to give the best sense.' *Preface, Text B*, p. xli. Ultimately Skeat came to the conclusion (as he admitted in a letter to us) that the Vernon MS. did *not* give the best readings. But, as we have tried to show below, it was probably the best MS. which Skeat was free to select in 1866.

[2] *Preface*, p. xvii.

[3] See Skeat's critical note on Passus v, 125 (p. 144).

[4] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 392.

[5] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 367–71.

[6] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 392.

[7] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 359–63.

personal taste': but 'The dangers arising from the exercise of personal taste or whim...are avoided by the critical method[1].' Dependence upon personal taste is to Dr Knott a sign of an 'unscientific' or 'unreliable' method.

Now we have been trying to show that the 'critical method' is such that the full results can, in the nature of things, only be attained by feeling one's way slowly, through successive stages—and in the first stage the first editor is *compelled* to depend largely upon his personal judgement. If this judgement is at fault, and the editor follows whim, he will go wrong. But no critical method will save a later editor either, *if* his judgement is at fault. The later editor, however, has the benefit of his predecessor's judgement, and of the data collected and published by him. This should restrict the range of possible error of the later editor, if he sets to work properly.

But in our view it is not a question of Skeat's 'older method' against Dr Knott's 'critical method.' Skeat's work represents an early stage and Dr Knott's (in so far as it is critical) represents a later stage of the same 'critical method.' The difference is simply that which must be found between the results of the first pioneer who, like Skeat, breaks fresh ground, and those of subsequent investigators like Dr Knott or ourselves who, having the spade work already done for them, are able to spend their time on a more minute and precise working over of the old ground. If Dr Knott's results—and ours—are more accurate than those of Skeat (and we hope they are) it is not because our methods are 'critical,' whilst Skeat's were 'unscientific' and 'unreliable,' but because we start with the benefit of the material which Skeat collected, whilst Skeat had, in the case of the A-text, to begin at the beginning.

Let us turn to Dr Knott's description of the 'critical method':

> The dangers arising from the exercise of personal taste or whim, and from reliance on mere number of MSS., are avoided by the critical method. A reading must not be valued according to the number of supporting MSS., for a large number of MSS. may be, and often are, descended from one common ancestor, from which the reading has been transmitted to its descendants.
>
> The necessity is therefore evident for classifying all extant MSS. according to their family relationships, and for constructing a family tree, before anything is done toward determining what readings ought to be adopted in the text[2].

The method of this classification Dr Knott explains:

> Two or more MSS., or two or more groups of MSS., are assigned to an identical, hypothetically reconstructed ancestor, or archetype, if they possess in common

[1] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 393. [2] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 393–4.

a number of clear errors, omissions, and additions.... It needs to be especially emphasized that the common possession of the *correct* reading by several MSS. is no proof at all that these MSS. are members of a group[1].

Now we would ask Dr Knott one question. If, as he rightly argues, MS. relationship is to be decided by the possession in common of *incorrect* readings, how can we decide such relationship '*before anything is done toward determining what readings ought to be adopted in the text*'? How can we tell which of two readings is the incorrect one, before we are allowed to do anything towards determining which is the correct one?

Dr Knott's critical method, with the neglect of which earlier editors are charged, places the editor in this position: he must construct the family tree of the manuscripts before he can do anything towards determining which are the correct readings; yet he must determine which are the incorrect readings before he can construct the family tree of the manuscripts.

This 'critical method' was certainly not followed by Professor Skeat. A sturdy common sense was Skeat's great characteristic, and he would have been the first to see that he was no more capable of 'classifying all extant MSS. according to their family relationships' and 'constructing a family tree' 'before anything is done toward determining what readings ought to be adopted in the text' than he was of walking a mile with his right foot before moving his left from the ground.

Dr Knott emphasizes, and rightly, the importance of the evidence of relationship supplied by the omission of lines in common by certain MSS. But this does not relieve the editor from 'the dangers arising from the exercise of personal taste' because even here the editor must constantly use his 'personal taste' to decide whether it is one set of MSS. which is *omitting* genuine lines, or the other which is *inserting* a spurious interpolation.

A concrete example will show this better than any amount of argument:

Amid the crowd in the fair field full of folk the visionary saw, according to most A-manuscripts:

> Wollene websteris and weueris of lynen,
> Taillours, tanneris, and tokkeris boþe[2].

These lines, however, are omitted from V and from H. Skeat considered them genuine and adopted them in his text, and all subsequent investigators have concurred. The omission of these genuine lines

[1] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 393–4.

[2] *Prologue*, 99, 100.

by both V and H constitutes, then, one of the numerous faults common to those two MSS., and is an argument for that grouping of them together which investigators, from Skeat onwards[1], have advocated. But it only becomes such an argument when we have decided that the lines *are* genuine, and ought as such to be adopted in the critical text. Suppose that a critic were to arise who should judge that they ought to be excluded from the text as an interpolation. Now the absence of an interpolation from several MSS. constitutes no presumption of any special connection between those MSS. But the presence of an interpolation in several MSS. does. The absence of the lines would cease to this critic to be an argument for the grouping of V and H together: but their presence would now become an argument for the grouping together of all the MSS. other than V and H.

Now the reader will see why so much must depend, *in the first instance*, upon the personal judgement of the editor. If he cannot form his family tree without deciding his text, or decide his text without forming his tree, he is compelled, as a first step, to use certain *a priori* tests of intrinsic probability, in which the individual taste and judgement play a great part.

When a scholar is bringing out the first edition of a bulky work, extant in many MSS., he will have to rely largely upon such tests[2]. He classifies the MSS., prints what he finds the best text, with collations of what he thinks good MSS. With this material to hand it becomes much more easy than before to get an accurate view of MS. relationships and values. Such a more accurate view may make a better edition possible; but the first edition was not necessarily uncritical, any more than the second edition is uncritical because it may in its turn help towards a third and still better one. In Skeat's words, 'This is all in the natural order of progress.' The shot which a gunnery lieutenant fires first, to get the range, may not actually hit the mark, and may yet be quite as creditable to his scientific gunnery as his subsequent shots which do.

But there is this essential difference between the gunner and the editor. In the case of a long poem, extant in very many MSS., it will seldom happen that the earliest editor will live to complete the definitive edition. *He* has to leave it to his successors to revise and complete his work, and to trust to their sense of fair play to do justice to the foundations which he has laid, and upon which they will build.

[1] *Preface, Text A* (E.E.T.S.), p. xviii.
[2] Such are the *a priori* tests enumerated by Moore, *Contributions*, pp. xxxv–xl.

Sometimes a later editor lacks this sense. 'Just so we have heard a baby mounted on the shoulder of its father cry out, "How much taller I am than Papa."' These words of Macaulay come inevitably to mind, when we hear a scholar of to-day criticizing the pioneer Middle English scholars of fifty years ago because they relied more than would be wise to-day upon some 'best' MS. or MSS., or upon 'personal taste'; as if, faced with a vast mass of quite unsifted evidence, they could possibly in the first instance have done anything else. It is not that the methods of earlier scholars were uncritical. It is that the best critical methods cannot, in the nature of things, yield final results in the first place. Repeated revision and correction is necessary. Textual criticism, as Westcott and Hort remind us[1], is negative: it consists in rejecting errors from the text. It is unreasonable to expect the first editor to reject *all* errors.

But it must not be supposed that Dr Knott's 'critical method' of classifying MSS. according to their genealogies or families is a new discovery. It was the method of the great textual critics of the last century, and Skeat, of course, used it. His very first step, made just fifty years ago, was to publish specimens of the 29 known MSS. of *Piers Plowman*, classifying them according to their types. The result was to define clearly for the first time[2] the existence of an A-text type and to show which MSS. belonged to that type—a veritable triumph of the 'genealogical' method. Next year Skeat published the first edition of this A-text, basing it upon the Vernon MS. Now it must be frankly admitted that this selection of the Vernon MS. as a basis has resulted in a text which, according to our present day knowledge, is not a final text. But it was a great and necessary step in the direction of such a final text.

As we have seen, the best MS. upon which to base a critical A-text has been judged by Dr Knott and by ourselves, working independently, to be the MS. at Trinity College, Cambridge (T). But there was one very good reason why Skeat did not use this as his basis.

The essential thing for Skeat in 1866 was to differentiate clearly the A-text from the B- and C-texts. But the scribe who wrote the archetype of Trinity had access *both* to an A- and to a C-text. We now know that, so long as he was transcribing the A-text, he followed it faithfully, and did not allow the C-text to intrude. We know this because now

[1] *Introduction*, p. 3.

[2] It had been tentatively conjectured by Price in his edition of Warton's *History of English Poetry*. (1824, II, 482; 1840, II, 63.)

we are able to compare the first eleven passus of Trinity with a fairly reliable text of the C-type, and we find that Trinity, so long as it is an A-text at all, presents a very pure A-type. But this advantage which we possess, of comparing Trinity with a fairly reliable C-text, was not possessed by Skeat working in 1866; because Skeat did not bring out such a fairly reliable C-text till 1873. He was bound, in 1866, to dismiss Trinity, as not being, on such evidence as he had, *certainly* a pure A-text, free from C-contamination.

The MS. next in importance we should judge to be Rawlinson. But Skeat could not use Rawlinson, because it was not discovered till his edition had been printed[1].

Of the remaining MSS., Vernon, University, and Harleian 875 are the best, and not very far removed from one another in value. On the whole, Vernon is the best of the three, and Skeat rightly selected it, and presented scholars with the first edition of the A-text of *Piers Plowman*—not a final A-text, but a first step, made on sound principles.

So inter-related are the texts, that before you can have a final A-text, you must have an adequate B- and C-text[2]. Skeat accordingly went on to the B- and C-texts. His work led the custodians of other MSS. to bring them to light, so that by 1885 he was able to produce specimens of 45 MSS., classified this time not only according to their types, but according to their *sub-types* also—a very successful application of the 'genealogical method.'

After this Skeat passed on to his other work, and never returned to *Piers Plowman*, though admitting that much remained to be done. If for some twenty more years scholars accepted as final the great three-text edition as published by Skeat, taking no steps to arrive at a more correct text, the fault was theirs, not Skeat's. Skeat's methods had throughout been thoroughly 'critical' and 'scientific.' He always attempted to ascertain the relative value of MSS. by classifying them according to their relationship.

That he did not attempt to tabulate these relationships in the form of an actual family tree does not mean that his methods were the less critical.

For indeed the adoration of trees is a form of fetish-worship now growing out of date. Trees showing the branching out of the Indo-

[1] The discovery of Rawlinson was indirectly due to Skeat: the immediate discoverer, Mr Parker, was assisting Skeat in his work. Certain pages, giving Passus XII from Rawlinson, and some account of the MS., were subsequently inserted into Skeat's A-text.

[2] As Dr Knott admits.

Germanic languages were a favourite recreation of the learned during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. And there was no harm in these trees; on the contrary, they were helpful. But no two were ever the same. And it would have been ludicrous had scholars attacked one another because their trees branched out in different ways, as Dr Knott attacks Chambers and Grattan because 'nine MSS. are either not located in their tree at all' [we never made a tree] 'or in whole or in part are located elsewhere than in mine.'

We never made a tree because the phenomena are, in fact, so complicated that no genealogical tree can properly express them[1]. A genealogical tree is based upon the physiological fact that every child has one father, and cannot change its parentage. There may be doubt as to that parentage. A violent Protestant at the beginning of the eighteenth century might deny that the Old Pretender was the son of James II. But not even the Vicar of Bray could have maintained that, till James fled the kingdom, he was really the legitimate son of James; that then he became a supposititious child introduced into the royal chamber by means of a warming pan; and remained so during the rest of his life except for an interval in 1715, when for a few months he was transformed into the legitimate heir.

But this, as we have tried to show in our first section, is exactly what *does* happen in the case of MSS. They undergo the most kaleidoscopic transmutations, and this often makes the construction of an actual family tree impossible. It follows that we must never confuse, as does Dr Knott, the 'genealogical method' with that particular application of the method which consists in constructing an actual genealogical tree of all the MSS.

The 'genealogical method' seeks to get at the traditions which lie behind different MSS. or groups of MSS., and to estimate the value of these traditions. We have shown that this method was used by Skeat, and that the fact that Skeat has placed us in a position to improve on some of his original estimates does not mean that he did not follow the 'critical method.'

That particular application of the 'genealogical method' which consists in constructing an actual family tree, and fixing the text rigidly in accordance with such tree, as explained by Dr Knott[2], can sometimes be pursued successfully. But its value as a method is impaired when-

[1] Dr Knott himself admits this. He gives a tree on p. 396, and shows on p. 402 how three trees are necessary to express the changing relations of certain MSS. This might have been much further developed.

[2] *Mod. Philol.*, XII, 394.

ever there has been cross-copying[1], and when any large degree of such 'contamination' prevails, the construction of an actual family tree of the MSS., far from being that instrument which its advocates claim, becomes little more than (as Dr Moore says) 'a pious hope[2].' It is generally the pious hope of scholars of a past generation. Karl Witte hoped that a tree might be constructed for all the MSS. of the *Divina Commedia*[3]. But has it? Will Dr Knott undertake to defend the tree constructed by Scartazzini?

Dr Knott quotes three authorities for 'expositions of critical processes.' Let us see how far they bear out his enunciation of the critical method of 'constructing a family tree before anything is done toward determining what readings ought to be adopted in the text.' These authorities are:

(1) Dr Eleanor Hammond, who outlines the method of the 'family-tree' in her *Chaucer Manual*. She adds: 'This discussion is general and elementary...the possibilities of contamination are not entered upon here.' But such general or elementary discussion offers no solution of the difficulties of the *Piers Plowman* MSS. It leaves off just where the real problem begins, since in the great majority of A-MSS. we can *prove* contamination, and everywhere we must suspect it.

(2) Westcott and Hort, who are amongst the greatest expositors of the 'critical' or 'genealogical' method. But so far from their method being that of Dr Knott, they brought out their critical text of the New Testament without any family tree of the extant MSS. at all[4].

(3) Moore in his *Contributions*. But this is what Moore has to say as to a 'family tree' of the MSS. of the *Divina Commedia*:

> My own belief would be that owing to the complicated intermixture of texts such a genealogy *never* can be constructed. I am certain that there is at least no approximate hope of it[5].

Again:

> I have often suspected *either* that a scribe copied different *Canti* or *Cantiche* from different exemplars, *or* that he sometimes had two or more exemplars before him.... For a few Cantos, two MSS. sometimes exhibit very striking coincidences, and then

[1] Cf. especially on this Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 1881, pp. 48, 49.

[2] *Contributions*, p. xxxi.

[3] 'Speravo di pervenire per questi lavori a poter distribuire per famiglie tutti i codici esistenti, formandone per così dire un grande albero genealogico' (*La Divina Commedia*, Berlino, 1862, p. lxxiv).

[4] Note especially *Introduction*, 1881, p. 58, where Westcott and Hort refer to the genealogical tree as a 'typical process,' and admit that we have often to be satisfied with 'rough and partial approximations' to it.

[5] *Contributions*, p. xxxi.

the resemblance suddenly disappears, often to be followed by equally remarkable coincidences in some totally different direction, which in their turn cease to guide us long. If such a practice of copying as that just indicated were at all common, all hope of anything like a complete and systematic classification of MSS. either 'genealogically' or even into 'families' must clearly be abandoned[1].

Again:

> This fact [the change in relationships] goes far to discourage the hope of anything like an *albero genealogico* of MSS. ever being constructed[2].

On the whole, the relations of the MSS. of *Piers Plowman* are probably not as complicated as those of the MSS. of the *Divina Commedia,* or of the Latin Classics[3] or of the New Testament[4]. In the case of the A-MSS. of *Piers Plowman* it is certainly possible to group them into families, as did Skeat: it is possible further to improve on Skeat's grouping: but we do not believe that it will ever be possible to make a genealogical tree which will fully depict the facts. The phenomena are too complicated, and will often need pages of explanation to express them. It is absurd to hope that they can be expressed by two straight lines joining three symbols.

It is this complexity of the problem which makes it impossible for the first student to arrive at final results: Dr Moore's great work on Dante is only a collection of materials for a text. This collection would have been impossible but for the text of Karl Witte, which forms the basis upon which the first part of it is built. And Witte in his turn was indebted to his predecessors. To an even greater extent the textual criticism of the New Testament is the work of successive generations of scholars.

It will be the same with *Piers Plowman.* So far from Skeat's work having been either 'unscientific' or 'unreliable,' it was so scientific and so reliable that all later work must be based upon Skeat's work, even where it supersedes that work.

The matter was very fairly summed up by Skeat himself in a letter to us:

> ...Owing to difficulties which could not be adequately understood or got over at the time when the 'Vernon' text was printed, but which *can* be adequately considered *now*, it has now become much easier to construct a correct A-text than it was in earlier days. This is all in the natural order of progress....

[1] *Contributions*, p. xxxiii. [2] p. xliii.

[3] 'Authors like Juvenal, read and copied and quoted both in antiquity and in the middle ages, have no strictly separated families of MSS. Lections are bandied to and fro from one copy to another, and all the streams of tradition are united by canals.' *Juvenal*, ed. Housman, p. xxiv.

[4] 'Almost every important document combines readings from more than one ancient source.' Westcott and Hort, *N. T.*, 1885, p. 544.

I am quite aware that it *may* become necessary for my A-text to be superseded. I comfort myself with the reflection that my work is by no means set aside, because it is really a reasonable basis for fresh work, and will lead to right results in the end and hereafter[1].

R. W. CHAMBERS.
J. H. G. GRATTAN.

ROUEN.

1 'And we come after, glening here and there,
And be ful glad if we may find an ere
Of any goodly word that ye hav left.'
R. W. C.; J. H. G. G.

POLITICAL PROPHECIES IN THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII.

When I was working on *The Pilgrimage of Grace* (published by my sister and myself in 1915) I was interested to see the part played in the movement by prophecies, but I could not then find any English book in which the origin and influence of political prophecies was treated. It is only recently that I have seen Mr Rupert Taylor's 'Columbia Study,' *The Political Prophecy in England* (1911), and found that it discussed the very questions which had puzzled me. The object of this short paper is therefore to illustrate Mr Taylor's book from my own reading.

The craving to gaze into the future arises naturally in times of great danger and distress. At the present moment political prophecy is no longer, as it seemed when Mr Taylor was writing five years ago, an ancient delusion over which an antiquary might potter. It is a reviving danger; newspapers and hoardings are filled with references to old predictions, and there has been tragic proof of their power in South Africa.

Novelty is not required in a prophecy, on the contrary, the newest try to assume an air of venerable old age, and even at the present day there are prophecies current which can be traced back to the time of anarchy when Stephen and Matilda were contending for the crown of England. At that time Geoffry of Monmouth collected some of them in his *Vita Merlini*, one in particular being some Latin verses 'that priests should bear arms,' which were appropriate enough, as most of the bishops were fighting for King or Empress[1]. In the first stages of the Reformation under Henry VIII, when the priests were again engaged in a life and death struggle, the prophecy was revived in various forms, such as 'that the priests should make a field and should rule England three days and nights[2],' or that:

[1] Taylor, *The Political Prophecy in England*, p. 16; Ward, *Catalogue of Romances in the MSS. Department of the B.M.*, pp. 282–3.

[2] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, vol. VIII, no. 736.

Holy Church shall harness hent
And III years stand on stere,
Meet and fight upon a bent
Even as they seculars were[1].

The Prophecy of Brother Johannes which was constantly repeated in the autumn of 1914 asserted that 'for the first time in history (!) priests should bear arms' in the present war.

Between the years 1534 and 1538 political prophecies made a deep impression on the minds of men, and consequently influenced to some extent the course of events. Thomas Cromwell bore in mind a saying which he had heard in 1512:

> That one with a Red Cap brought up from low degree to high estate [Wolsey] should rule all the land under the King...and afterwards procure the King to take another wife, divorce his lawful wife Queen Katharine, and involve the land in misery...that divorce should lead to the utter fall of the said Red Cap...and after much misery the land should by another Red Cap [Pole] be reconciled or else be brought to utter destruction[2].

The shrewd, witty, gossiping Chapuys, Imperial ambassador in England, wrote one of his incomparable letters to Charles V on New Year's Day, 1535, in which he said:

> Booksellers have been forbidden to sell or keep a prognostication lately made in Flanders, which threatens the King with war and misfortune this year; and some of the leading men of the Council have said that, matters being as they are, nothing is wanted to set the realm topsy turvy but to translate and publish the said prognostication in English[3].

Later in the year he referred to the matter again:

> A religious doctor of my acquaintance has come to ask me for a prognostication of the mutiny that is to take place against the governors of this realm, of which prognostication [word illegible] was desired on behalf of Lord Bray, a learned, rich and good nobleman[4].

This may be the vague but impressive prophecy which the common people were repeating, that there would be one month rainy and full wet, next month death, and the third month war[5].

Straightforward statements like these could be understood by everyone, but the majority of English prophecies were symbolic and required interpretation. Becket's murder was supposed to have been foretold in the words 'the son shall slay the father in the womb of the mother.' This certainly dates from the twelfth century; it may have been composed after the event, but it may just as well have been earlier, for the terms are so vague that they need not refer to that particular crime[6]. The monks of Furness were using the same symbol

[1] Murray, *Thomas of Ercildoune* (E.E.T.S.), append. 2.
[2] Merriman, *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, vol. I, chap. xi.
[3] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, VIII, no. 1.
[4] *Ibid.* no. 327.
[5] *Ibid.* no. 771.
[6] Taylor, *op. cit.* pp. 23, 136.

in 1536 when they encouraged their tenants to rebel against Henry VIII by telling them 'that the decorate rose shall be slain in his mother's belly,' meaning that the King should be slain by the hands of the priests[1]. In the first case, Becket, a father of the Church, was put to death by the orders of Henry II, a son of the Church, before the very altar. In the second application it was suggested that Henry VIII, a son of the Church which he persecuted, would be killed by a father of the Church.

A form of the symbolic prophecy which was more popular on the continent than in England was the Sibyllic, in which people were alluded to by their initials, by numbers, or by puns upon their names. Examples of this type in England are usually brief, as in another saying of the monks of Furness 'that A B and C should sit all in one seat, and should work great marvels[2]'; here A B and C probably stand for Anne Boleyn and Cranmer. There was another very popular rhyme about Cromwell, Katharine of Arragon, and the Lady Mary:

> Much ill cometh of a small note
> As Crum well set in a man's throat
> That shall put many other to pain, God wote;
> But when Crumwell is brought a-low
> And we read out the Christ Cross Row
> Of K L M then shall we have news[3].

The pun of 'Crum well' occurs again in a little story of the seventeenth century 'of Dr Bowls of Oundle....This Dr in the times of Oliver at their Healths and merry-meetings would take a Crum of bread, and swallow it, saying, God send this Crum-well down. Yet he gott nothing when the King came in[4].'

The Sibyllic Prophecy was a legacy from the Roman Empire. It was natural for an educated and highly civilised people to take pleasure in playing upon numbers and letters; but the indigenous English form of prophecy is that called Galfridian, in which persons and countries are represented by animals and other living creatures[5]. It is an inheritance from the Welsh bards and is characteristic of a nation still retaining some of the savage beliefs which in an earlier state of society produced totemism; a feeling lingered that there was no vital distinction between man and beast, that one might in some circumstances be changed into the other, and that of the two a beast was wiser, more powerful and more magical than a man.

[1] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, XII (1), no. 841.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.* no. 318.
[4] *Camden Miscellany*, vol. XI, p. 80.
[5] Taylor, *op. cit.* p. 10.

In order to give a prophecy an air of verisimilitude, the writer frequently dated it earlier than the real time of composition, and retold historical facts as part of the prediction. Thus Geoffry of Monmouth's *Book of Merlin* in his *Historia Regum Brittaniae* begins with an account of the Saxon, Danish and Norman invasions, which Merlin is supposed to foretell. But when the meaning of this had been forgotten, these obscure forebodings of hostile invasions were expected to be fulfilled at some future time. A man was executed in 1538 for quoting from the *Prophecies of Merlin, Bede and Rymour*[1]; one of the offending verses was:

> When the black fleet of Norway is comen and gone
> And drenched in the flood truly
> Mickle war hath been beforne
> But after shall none be[2].

This verse in turn developed into the Armada prophecy which is given by Bacon in his essay *Of Prophecies.*

Indefinite, figurative prophecies of this kind depended for their force on their interpretation. One Layman a prophesier and apparently a native of Bristol showed the monks of Sion monastery in 1535 the prophecies of Merlin, and interpreted them to mean 'that the Pope would be in England ere Midsummer.' For listening to him the vicar of Isleworth and several other persons were executed[3]. The book which he showed them was probably the popular *Prophecies of Merlin, Bede and Rymour* mentioned above. In October 1536 the Prior of the White Friars of Scarborough showed his friends a copy of it, which was afterwards carried off from his room by the rebels during the Pilgrimage of Grace[4].

The prophecy of the Mouldwarp had perhaps most influence on politics. It occurs first in the *Prophecy of the Six Kings to follow King John,* written about the middle of Edward II's reign. The sixth king after King John was to be the Mouldwarp or Mole, who would be proud, caitiff and cowardly, having a skin like a goat. He was to be attacked by a dragon, a wolf from the west and a lion from Ireland, who would drive him from the land, leaving him only an island in the sea, where he would pass his life in great sorrow and strife and die by drowning. England would be divided into three parts, of which the

[1] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,* XII (2), nos. 1212, 1231.
[2] Murray, *op. cit.* append. 2.
[3] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,* VIII, nos. 565, 567.
[4] *Ibid.* XII (2), nos. 1212, 1231.

dragon and the lion would rule two, but the ruler of the third, probably the wolf, is not named[1].

This was the prophecy used against Henry IV by Percy, Glendower and Mortimer[2] and alluded to by Shakespeare in *I Henry IV*, III, 1, 149. Percy was the lion, Glendower the dragon and Mortimer the wolf, and they intended to divide England into three parts, one for each, according to the prophecy. It failed in their case, but it was revived against Henry VIII and seems to have been particularly popular among the clergy. The vicar of Isleworth was accused of calling the King a 'molywarppe[3].' The vicar of Londesborough was tried at York in 1535 for saying that the King would be destroyed by the most vile people in the world 'and that he should be glad to take a boat for safeguard of his life and flee into the sea, and forsake his own realm.' The vicar also spoke much about future battles, and he seems to have been quoting the conclusion of the Mouldwarp prophecy[4]. The vicar of Mustone said that the King would be driven out of his own realm and then return and be content with a third part of it[5]. In this case the unappropriated third was to be restored to the King.

Wilfred Holme, a Yorkshire schoolmaster, in 1537 wrote an account of the Pilgrimage of Grace of 1536, called *The Fall and Evil Success of Rebellion*. The narrative is in verse, and one section was devoted to proving that Henry VIII was not the Mouldwarp, as the rebels falsely alleged, for he was not the sixth king after King John, and he was neither coward, caitiff nor hairy. Holme does not explain how the rebels interpreted the prophecy, but they might claim that the Dragon was their leader Robert Aske, as 'ask' means a dragon or serpent. The lion out of Ireland might be the Duke of Norfolk, who had conducted a campaign in Ireland. The rebels hoped to win him to their side, though they failed to do so. I cannot identify the wolf.

Another old prophecy used by the rebels was the 'Cock in the North,' which occurs first in the *Prophecy of John of Bridlington* dating from c. 1363. It referred originally to the Black Prince as the future King of France, by a pun on 'galli' cocks, and 'Galli' Gauls[6]. Later the symbol was used to represent a northern nobleman, perhaps Sir Henry Percy, Hotspur[7]. The lines 'that the cock of the north shall be plucked and pulled, and curse the time that ever he was lord, but afterwards he shall busk him and brush his feathers, and call

[1] Taylor, *op. cit.* p. 50.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 48.
[3] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, VIII, no. 565.
[4] *Ibid.* IX, no. 791.
[5] *Ibid.* XII (2), nos. 1212, 1231.
[6] Taylor, *op. cit.* pp. 54, 57.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 76.

his chickens together, and after that he shall do great adventures,' were applied by the vicar of Mustone to Lord Lumley, whose crest was a cock[1]. According to Wilfred Holme the rebels of the Pilgrimage had a prophecy among themselves which may have been derived from the same source:

> Forth shall come a worm, an ask with one eye;
> He shall be the chief over the meiny.
> He shall gather of chivalry a full fair flock,
> Half capon and half cock.
> The chicken shall the capon slay.
> And after that there shall be no may.

The 'ask' of these lines is of course Robert Aske, who had only one eye[2]. The rest seems to defy any reasonable interpretation. If the rhyme had been in Latin one might have suspected that in the allusions to the capon, the cock and the chicken there was some pun on the name of Pole and the word 'pullus,' as the rebels expected Cardinal Pole to help them. The last word is 'may' in Wilfred Holme's book, but it would make slightly better sense to read 'nay,' meaning 'after that there shall be no refusal (of our demands).'

The prophecies of Merlin were influential in Scotland as well as in England. From the divorce of Katharine of Arragon in 1533 to the birth of Edward in 1537 the right of inheritance to the English throne was in dispute. Each of Henry's daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, was in turn declared illegitimate, and his nearest male relative was his nephew James V of Scotland. James's claim was very much disliked in England and he was on bad terms with his uncle; consequently the relations between the two countries were strained. In 1535 men in Edinburgh were reading the *Prophecies of Merlin*, which they interpreted to mean that James would be crowned King of England in London before midsummer two years later, and that before then 'a horse worth 10*s.* shall be able to bear all the noble blood of England[3].' It is of course impossible to tell how much effect these prophecies had on their hearers, but they certainly frightened the government. A man who mentioned the Scotch prophecies in England was arrested and tortured. It also seems quite clear that during the Pilgrimage of Grace the monks and parish priests quoted prophecies to encourage men to join the rebels. A vague tradition of their influence may be preserved in Yorkshire by the legend of Mother Shipton; in the collection of modern inanities which pass for prophecies under

[1] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, XII (2), nos. 1212, 1231.
[2] *Ibid.* XI, no. 1103.
[3] *Ibid.* XII (2), no. 80.

that name it is always said that Mother Shipton lived near York in Henry VIII's reign, and in a letter of 22nd February 1537 there is an allusion to the witch of York[1].

At the same time a rival form of prediction was increasing in popularity. This was astrology, which in due course superseded the older forms of prophecy. There appears to be a curious example of belief in astrology in 1533, when a girl wandered about Lincolnshire giving out that she was the King's daughter Mary. Her story was:

> That the French queen was her aunt and her godmother, and upon a time the said French queen, being of her pleasure in a bath, and she with her there, looked upon a book and said to her, 'Niece Mary, I am right sorry for you, for I see here that your fortune is very hard: you must go a-begging once in your life, either in your youth or your age.' 'And therefore,' the girl said, 'I take it upon me now in my youth, and I intend to go beyond the sea to mine uncle the emperor, as soon as I may get shipping[2].'

Although the description of the prophecy is not very definite, it seems to imply a horoscope giving the fortune of the individual for whom it was drawn up, and not one of the vague general prophecies which I have been discussing.

The art of foretelling the future—call it prophecy or astrology or what you please—is probably as widespread and as powerful today as ever it was, but we do not see it so much, because its growth is hidden and subterranean. It is 'the thing on the blind side of the heart, on the wrong side of the door.' In itself it is uncanny and evil, and can do nothing but harm; nevertheless it has had one or two harmless and even agreeable developments. One of these is the modern political cartoon, which can trace its ancestry back to very ancient prophetic pictures. In 1537 the Prior of Malton described to a friend a picture of this sort which he had seen fifteen or twenty years before; it showed a moon waxing and waning, each moon with the date of a year beneath. Over the full moon was drawn a Cardinal and under the old moon two headless monks; in the midst was a child with axes and butchers' knives and instruments about him[3]. The two headless monks recall the complementary 'two monks' heads' in a prophecy which was parodied in *Piers Plowman* about the third quarter of the fourteenth century:

> Ac I warne yow werkemen, wynneth while ye mowe,
> For hunger hiderward hasteth hym faste,
> He shal awake with water wastours to chaste.

[1] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, XII (1), no. 479.
[2] *Ibid.* VI, no. 1193.
[3] *Ibid.* XII (1), no. 534.

Ar five yere be fulfilled suche famyn shal aryse,
Thorowgh flodes and thourgh foule wederes fruits shul faille,
And so sayde saturne and sent yow to warne,
When ye se the sonne amys and two monkes hedes[1].

This in turn links itself with a saying of 1535; after the execution of the Carthusian monks in that year there was a very wet summer, and men said that the rain was God's vengeance for the monks' death[2].

Allusions to prophecies in literature usually take the form of parodies, as in the above quotation. A play called *Albion Knight*, which probably dates from 1538, contains a song about 'a lusty captain' and 'a boar with a tusk' which seems to be a parody of the rebels' verses in the Pilgrimage of Grace[3]. A later and more celebrated example is the Fool's mock prophecy in *King Lear*.

Partly owing to the influence of parody, and partly to the repressive measures of the government, the Galfridian beast-prophecy sank among the common people to mere nonsense, but it attained to a higher development at the hands of the rising school of English poets, who used it as a graceful theme for minor verse. In the court poetry of the time a nobleman might be alluded to as the animal which he bore on his crest, when the allusion was not political, but simply a literary convention, and this convention appears to be derived from the prophecies. An early instance of it is found in a poem written by the Earl of Surrey to a lady who refused to dance with him. The Earl calls himself a prancing white lion, from the white lion rampant of his badge, while the lady is a white wolf. She may have been Anne Stanhope, afterwards the wife of the Earl of Hertford, Surrey's rival and enemy, and the playful little poem may have been a tiny move in the quarrel which led in the end to Surrey's execution[4].

Mr Taylor in his interesting book remarks that 'particular instances of the direct influence of prophecies are difficult to find.' Following the general outlines of his study and making use of his research, I have endeavoured to illustrate what he says by means of examples selected out of the great number which occur in the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*. Of course it is difficult to estimate the exact effect of the prophecies, but in these cases we see men in the act of repeating them to their friends and dependents as arguments for a particular course of action, and we see also that they were punished for doing so.

[1] Taylor, *op. cit.* p. 127.
[2] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, VIII, no. 949.
[3] Farmer, *Lost Tudor Plays* (Early Eng. Drama Soc.); *The Library*, April, 1913.
[4] *A Song written by the Earl of Surrey of a lady that refused to dance with him.*

A prophecy was not the sole force leading to a political movement, but it was an expression of uneasiness and of a desire for change; as it was whispered about a countryside, it excited men and filled them with the expectation of surprising events. This restlessness in turn alarmed the government and gave rise to the series of laws against 'any false prophecy upon occasion of arms, fields, letters, names, cognizances or badges,' which slowly crushed out the life of the Galfridian prophecy[1].

MADELEINE HOPE DODDS.

GATESHEAD.

[1] Taylor, *op. cit.* pp. 105, 124.

NEW MATERIAL ON THOMAS CAREW.

I. *The Present Texts.*

It is a well-known fact that Thomas Carew was an extremely fastidious poet, so much so that Suckling said of him,

> The issue of 's brain
> Was seldom brought forth but with trouble and pain.

This careful polishing of his work, however, was Carew's method of perfecting a gem, and to it to a large extent his reputation is due. It is greatly to be regretted, therefore, that we have no satisfactory edition of Carew's work, that is, an edition which includes all his extant poems, which omits those that have been erroneously attributed to him (with evidence for so doing), and which is as free as may be from textual errors. The reasons for this lack are that Carew himself never edited his work for publication and that modern scholars have not studied contemporary manuscript copies sufficiently to produce the best possible results.

The first edition of Carew's work appeared in 1640, after his death, compiled from a very faulty manuscript, as is shown by the fact that it includes several poems by other writers, omits several which are undoubtedly Carew's, and exhibits a text which in many cases certainly does not give us the actual words of the poet. Modern scholarship has done something towards correcting the first two of these evils, but practically nothing in the case of the last. There have been three scholarly editions of Carew, that of Hazlitt for the Roxburghe Club in 1870, that of Ebsworth in 1893, and that of Vincent for the 'Muses' Library' in 1898. Hazlitt's chief contribution over the early editions was the addition of a dozen or so poems taken from seventeenth-century manuscripts, most of which show little or no real evidence of Carew's hand. Ebsworth follows closely in Hazlitt's footsteps, so far as the content of his volume is concerned, but quite rightly objects to the acceptance of a handful of poems and quite wrongly upholds that of certain others. Vincent does very well to drop most of these doubtful pieces from his edition altogether, but, as he in most cases presents no

evidence for so doing, his decisions have only the validity of his own personal opinion plus Ebsworth's earlier work. No one, however, has carefully edited the text; at least no one has used all the available material to make it as perfect as it might be.

To do this properly would involve an entire new edition of Carew's work, which is not the purpose of this article. The available material referred to consists of seventeenth-century manuscripts in the British Museum, the Bodleian, St John's College, Cambridge, certain private libraries, and perhaps elsewhere. Hazlitt examined a very few of these and describes them briefly in the preface to his edition, but his remarks there are both inadequate and inaccurate. Ebsworth and Vincent do not give evidence of having gone much beyond Hazlitt's sources here. For the present article, I have gone twice through all such manuscripts that I have been able to lay my hands on by means of library catalogues and other references, some seventy or eighty in all. Since, as I have shown, the early printed copies were based on some manuscript similar to these, and a very faulty one at that, it must be clear that evidence drawn from any contemporary manuscript should have certainly equal weight with that of the first or succeeding early editions, as the latter failed to correct the mistakes originally made. Thus the warnings voiced by Ebsworth and Vincent against accepting manuscript evidence are not to be regarded seriously.

Although the purpose of my investigation has been principally to settle the various problems connected with the doubtful poems, it is worth while to cite a few of the textual emendations I have been able to make *en passant*, both for the sake of correctness itself and in order further to invalidate the seemingly hypnotic influence of the printed page of the first edition. In small matters there are differences of reading in almost every poem, and the editor here can do no more than take that reading which seems to him the best; in larger things a change of reading may legitimately be made where a passage is at present nonsense and a single new version is intelligible, or where the change is supported by the agreement of several manuscripts.

In the second *Epitaph to Mary Villiers*, a considerable stretch of the imagination is required to make anything of these lines:

> But the weak mould
> Could the great guest no longer hold:
> The substance was too pure, the flame
> Too glorious, that thither came.
> Ten thousand Cupids brought along
> A grace on each wing, that did throng
> For place there, etc.

The poet is here trying to say that the maiden's death was due to the fact that the 'clayey tenement' could not hold her great soul. Surely the passage as given cannot stand beside the one below, which beginning the same, concludes:

> The frame
> So glorious that thither came
> Ten thousand Cupids bearing along
> A grace on each wing that did throng
> For place there[1].

Again, in *The Comparison*, in describing his mistress's complexion, the poet is made by most of our editors to say that it

> Aurora's blush resembles, or that red
> That frisketh in when her mantle 's spread.

If anyone can visualize the latter part of this conceit, he can go even Carew one better, who actually wrote:

> Aurora's blush resembles or that red
> That Iris struts in when her mantle 's spread[2].

To mention but a few other cases: Cupid's wings are *painted*, not *panting*[3]; the precious amethyst is *whiter*, not *witty*[4]; the lady who once was prodigal with her graces is now *scant*, not *scarce*[5]; the musician in playing one piece over and over displeases the *hearers*, not the *heavens*[6]; *La. Pen.*, to whom an elegy is written, is Lady Peniston[7]. It is not worth while to continue this list here.

II. *Doubtful Poems.*

The poems discussed under this heading include all those which have caused doubts as to their authorship in the mind of any commentator[8]. In citing the manuscript occurrences of the poems, I give

[1] Given by Harl. 6917, p. 26, one of the most carefully compiled MSS. I have seen.

[2] This correction is made, along with several others that have escaped notice (e.g. *To my Friend G. N.*, l. 144, for *circle* read *sickle*), in the *Errata* of the first edition. The better reading also occurs in every MS. I have seen, e.g. Add. 22118, f. 5, and 25303, f. 78; Eg. 2725, p. 309; Harl. 3511, p. 102. Ebsworth prints 'Iris frisks in.'

[3] *Upon the Sickness of E. S.*, l. 32. Better reading, Add. 33998, p. 42.

[4] *Epitaph on Lady S.*, l. 15. Better reading, Harl. 6917, p. 27.

[5] *Persuasions to Love*, l. 12. Better reading, Add. 25303, f. 159.

[6] *To his Friend*, l. 3. Better reading occurs wherever the poem is found in MSS. and also in Wood's *Athenae* (ed. Bliss) where it was first printed. Hazlitt miscopied it from Ash. 38 and later editors followed him.

[7] Given by Rawl. F 160, f. 54. Ebsworth gives it as Lady Pennington. Vincent preserves it as La. Pen., but in his notes says that the lady was Martha, wife of Thos. Peniston of Leigh.

[8] I do not include Herrick's *Enquiry* and *Primrose*, the authorship of which, though they occurred in the first edition of Carew, has never been seriously questioned. For notes on them, see F. W. Moorman's edition of Herrick, introd. and appen.

only those not heretofore collated[1]. For the others, see the three editions of Carew already referred to.

1. *The Spark.* This poem was first claimed from Carew for Suckling in *The Last Remains of Sir John Suckling,* published with 'the licence and approbation of his noble and dearest friends' in 1659[2]. Anderson and Chalmers in their collections of British poetry and Hazlitt in his editions of Carew and Suckling, all calmly give it without comment to both poets[3]. Ebsworth includes it without question among Carew's work; Vincent says dogmatically that it is by Suckling but gives no convincing reason for so doing. It may be found in manuscript in Eg. 2725, p. 135; Add. 33998, p. 144; and Dobell, f. 43. In the first of these it has the initials *T. C.* after the title and *W. P.* at the end; in the two others it is subscribed *Walter Poole.* The evidence in the case certainly favours Poole, especially as it is unlikely that two different collectors would attribute it to an almost unknown poet unless he were actually the author, whereas we know that the more popular writers were often saddled with poems they did not write. Moreover, both manuscripts which give it to Poole are carefully compiled, Add. 33998 being the best of all I have seen. The initials *W. P.* at the end of the poem in Eg. 2725 must also count for something. Poole seems to be quite unknown except as a man whose verses occasionally turn up in contemporary manuscripts.

2. *On his Mistress Going to Sea.* Uncollated occurrences of this poem are: Ash. 47, art. 176; Malone 21, f. 48; Rawl. F 160, f. 112; St J. 416, no. 35; Add. 25707, f. 110; Eg. 2725, p. 156; Stowe 962, f. 33. Ebsworth and Vincent, who discuss the problem of this poem at some length, agree in giving it to Thos. Carey of the royal bedchamber. To their information, I can add the facts that in St J. 416 it is subscribed H. [?] Murry[4], and in Eg. 2725 it is entitled *Mr. Murrey of the Bechamber to a Young Lady Going to Holland.* This complicates the question of who actually did write the poem, but at least it lends weight to the belief that Carew did not.

[1] The MSS. referred to herein are distributed as follows: Ashmole, Malone, and Rawlinson are in the Bodleian; St John's, in St John's College, Cambridge; Additional, Egerton, Harley, Sloane, and Stowe, in the British Museum; the Cosens and Wyburd MSS. were two privately owned collections to which Hazlitt and Ebsworth had access, but which I have not been able to locate; the Dobell MS. is in the possession of Mr Bertram Dobell, bookseller, Charing Cross Road, London. The last has not previously been examined.

[2] Vincent is mistaken in saying (ed. Carew, p. 260) that the poem was first claimed for Suckling in 1696.

[3] When given to Suckling, the title is *The Guiltless Inconstant.*

[4] The catalogue of the St John's College MSS. gives this name as *H. Merry.* The last name, however, is clearly *Murry* in the MS.

3. *Methodus Amandi.* The case of this poem is well set forth by Ebsworth, who gives it also to Thos. Carey. In this Vincent concurs. New manuscript sources are: Malone 13, f. 45, where it is subscribed *T. Carew, B. Chamb.*; Eg. 2725, p. 137, unattributed; and Harl. 6917, p. 73, subscribed, in a different hand, *Sid. Godolphin.* The evidence of Malone 13, in addition to that already in hand, makes the case pretty conclusive for Carey, especially as this manuscript contains a number of Godolphin's poems correctly ascribed to him. In Saintsbury's *Minor Caroline Poets*, it is erroneously included among Godolphin's work, probably on the evidence of Harl. 6917[1].

4. *To his Mistress Retiring in Affection.* The only evidence up to the present on this verse has been that of Add. 11811, f. 6, where it is subscribed *Tho. Cary*, a spelling of Carew's name consistently used in this collection. It occurs also in Add. 22118, f. 40, subscribed *Tho. Carew.* As it is much in Carew's manner and is nowhere attributed to anyone else, we may accept it as undoubtedly his.

5. *Excuse for Absence.* Hazlitt and Ebsworth both say that this poem occurs only in the Cosens MS., where it is initialed *T. C.* Ebsworth says that it is 'probably genuine'; Vincent on the contrary discards it without comment. It is to be found also in Ash. 47, art. 51; Rawl. F 160, f. 106, and 209, f. 4; Add. 30982, f. 11; Eg. 2421, f. 4, and 2725, p. 136. In none of these is it attributed to anyone. But in Rawl. F 209 and Add. 30982, it occurs among well-known poems by Carew. This lends weight to the evidence of the Cosens MS. So far as internal evidence goes, the poem might certainly be claimed for Carew. Thus here Ebsworth seems to be right and Vincent wrong.

6. *Mr Carew to his Friend.* The authenticity of this poem has not been seriously disputed, but the evidence other than stylistic in favour of Carew is slight. Bliss in his edition of Wood's *Athenae* first printed it, taking it from Ash. 38, art. 81, from which Hazlitt also copied it. It may be also found, under the title *To a Friend*, in Add. 22118, f. 7, and 30982, f. 10 and f. 128; Sloane 1792, f. 95; and under the title *To his Mistress* in Harl. 6917, p. 136. As will be noted, Carew's name is connected with it only in Ash. 38, where it also bears his initials at the end[2]. B. Dobell includes it among the

[1] Prof. Saintsbury writes to me that according to his recollection the poem was included by one of his assistants among Godolphin's work on the evidence of this MS., but is unable to throw further light upon the Godolphin claim.

[2] Vincent is mistaken in saying (*op. cit.*, p. 258) that this poem occurs in Add. 22118, f. 40, subscribed *T. Cary*. No such poem occurs here, and no piece in the whole volume is signed in this way.

poems of Wm. Strode in his edition of that writer, saying, 'This poem has been attributed to Donne and to Carew; but I believe Strode has the best title to it[1].' This statement of belief can hardly be considered as evidence, especially as the editor ascribed to Strode several poems on which there is grave doubt, to say the least. On the evidence before us, the poem must be given to Carew, as has tacitly been done by his three editors.

7. *A Lady's Prayer to Cupid.* This poem is said to occur in the Cosens MS., with Carew's initials, 'and not elsewhere.' It occurs also in Ash. 47, art. 50; Rawl. F 209, f. 4; Harl. 6057, f. 45, unsubscribed in all cases. Vincent discards it. The case here is exactly similar to that of the *Excuse for Absence.* The fact that neither of these poems is otherwise attributed to Carew tends to invalidate the authority of the Cosens MS., and since the style of *A Lady's Prayer* is certainly not suggestive of Carew, it seems best to exclude it from his work.

8. *When the Snow Fell.* Hazlitt included this piece among Carew's for the sole reason that it occurs next to *The Amorous Fly* in Ash. 38. Such evidence by itself is worthless, as anyone familiar with these manuscript miscellanies must know. Herrick, Munsey, and Strode have also been suggested as the author[2]. The poem is found in at least eighteen manuscripts beside the one Hazlitt knew of, and not once is it attributed to Carew. In several cases there are extra lines, and in others there is a complementary stanza, in which the snowflake is replaced by a spark which flew into the young lady's bosom and was extinguished by the snow there. In all instances except one her name is Chloris, not Celia; and the title, when present, is usually *Upon his Mistress Walking in the Snow.* Its occurrences are: Rawl. F 117, f. 163, subscribed *Munsey,* and 160, f. 113; Add. 11811, f. 1, subscribed *Wil. Munsey*; 19268, f. 23, subscribed *W. Strode*; 22603, f. 8, subscribed *Dr. Corbet*; 23229, f. 46, 25303, f. 181, subscribed *W. S.*; 30982, f. 158, 33998, p. 121, subscribed *Wil. Stroud*; Eg. 2421, f. 3, subscribed *Stroude,* and 2725, p. 225; Harl. 3511, p. 27, 6396, f. 9, and 6931, f. 4, subscribed *William Stroud*; Sloane 1446, f. 76, 1454, f. 26, and 1792, f. 10; Stowe 962, f. 179. The complementary stanza occurs by itself in Sloane 1446, f. 23, subscribed *W. S.* Dobell includes both poems in his edition of

[1] Dobell, *Poetical Works of Wm. Strode*, p. 100. Mr Bertram Dobell, son of the editor, tells me that his father collected Strode's poems from two MSS. in his possession, but is unable to say what the evidence in this particular case was. The claim for Donne's authorship is no longer made.

[2] By Hazlitt, Ebsworth, and Dobell respectively.

Strode, and is probably right in doing so; certainly the claim for Carew is untenable.

9. *The Mournful Parting of Two Lovers.* This poem was included by Hazlitt, and consequently by Ebsworth, on the single evidence of the subscription *T. Car.* in Harl. 6057. The collector here is not to be trusted, as his MS. contains various poems erroneously attributed. Moreover the Harleian version of the poem is very faulty, in some places making no sense whatever, especially when miscopied by Hazlitt. The evidence of this manuscript being thus invalidated, the poem goes to Henry King on the authority of three manuscripts. Two of these are mentioned but not named by Hannah, who included the poem without question in his edition of King's work in 1843; the third is Add. 25303, f. 173, where it is subscribed *Dr H. K.*, although a later hand has drawn a line through this. It occurs also in Add. 21433, f. 151, 25303, f. 167, 25707, f. 157; Eg. 2725, p. 141; Sloane 1446, f. 89. In the last it is initialed *T. B.*; in the others no author is given. In all cases except the Harleian the text is that which is found in the printed copies of King's works; the proper title is *The Surrender*[1].

10. *To his Unconstant Mistress.* Hazlitt and Harl. 6057 are again responsible for saddling Carew with this poem. In the manuscript, f. 11, it is subscribed *Th. Car.* Ebsworth accepts it as Carew's, but Vincent gives it to King. It occurs also in Add. 21433, f. 149, and 25303, f. 166, without attribution. It is doubtless King's, having occurred both in the early editions of that poet and in manuscripts either over his name or together with other poems of his[2].

11. *A Health to his Mistress.* This was also taken from Harl. 6057 by Hazlitt, where it is subscribed *Th. Car.* Since this MS. has already been shown to attribute two poems erroneously to Carew, and since this one is not otherwise connected with his name, it is hardly safe to accept it as his. The internal evidence turns the scale against it. I have not found it elsewhere in manuscript.

12. *Prologue and Epilogue to a Play.* Hazlitt copied these two poems into Carew's work from the Wyburd MS. Ebsworth follows the lead given. Neither editor states whether or not the poems are there attributed to Carew. Moreover Ebsworth says, in describing this manuscript, that its errors are 'both numerous and glaring.' Vincent

[1] Vincent (*op. cit.*, p. 178), Mason (ed. King, p. 29), and Quiller-Couch (*Oxford Book of English Verse*, p. 236), all give the poem to King, but they do not show any definite evidence for so doing.

[2] Mason (*op. cit.*, p. 194) says that he has taken the poem from MSS. but he fails to designate them more definitely.

omits both poems, but as usual gives no reasons. Certainly more evidence is needed before they are to be accepted as Carew's.

13. *Ode,* 'Phillis though thy powerful charms.' Here is another case of including a poem because it is next to an authentic one of Carew's in a manuscript copy. The MS. from which Hazlitt took it, Ash. 36, is a scrap-book of various papers in different handwritings, and the *Ode* has no more to do with the *Rapture,* which it follows, than one book has to do with another on the library table. It is in a different handwriting and on a different kind of paper. The poem here has three verses. The second and third, for some unknown reason, Hazlitt omits, and Ebsworth relegates them to the appendix. Vincent sensibly omits all three.

14. *Verses,* 'He gave her jewels.' This has been attributed to Carew solely because it is next to 'Ask me no more' in the Wyburd MS. *Verbum sap.*

15. *To Mistress Katherine Neville,* two poems. I can add here to the notes by Ebsworth[1] on the first, 'White Innocence, etc.' that it occurs in St J. 416, no. 37, entitled *To the Green Sickness* and subscribed *T. Carew,* and in Add. 6918, f. 66, unattributed. To Vincent's notes on the second poem, I can add nothing. Both editors agree in accepting the former and discarding the latter; in this I concur.

16. *The Hue and Cry.* This poem was first claimed from Carew by Shirley in 1646, and as Vincent points out, the latter's claim is without doubt the better. The fact that the poem, when occurring in the early editions of Carew, had considerable variations from the Shirley version, leads Vincent to think that Carew may have reworked it. It is extremely doubtful to my mind if this be the case, since there is often variation among contemporary manuscripts, and, as I have shown, Carew's poems were first printed from no very perfect one. The variations here are no greater than those of Poole's *Guiltless Inconstant* and King's *Surrender* compared with the Carew versions. I prefer to think the poem altogether Shirley's[2]. Its occurrence in Harl. 3511, p. 126, has not yet been collated.

17. *Another Hue and Cry.* Ebsworth and Vincent are quite right in discarding this poem from Carew's work. Hazlitt included it, as in the case of others, because it was found among Carew's in the Wyburd MS. Anderson in his *British Poets* gives it to Drayton. This is supported by the fact that it occurs, initialed *M. D.,* in Harl. 3511, p. 55. It may

[1] In Ebsworth's note (p. 186), 23118 is a misprint for 22118.
[2] Dyce also gives the poem to Shirley, *Works of Shirley,* VI, 410.

be found also, unattributed, in Ash. 38, art. 155 (and repeated on p. 122); Malone 21, f. 66; Eg. 2725, f. 170; Stowe 962, f. 132.

18. *To his Mistress Confined.* Vincent was the first to point out that this poem also was claimed from Carew by Shirley in 1646. We are bound to respect Shirley's statement that he wrote the poem, but there are difficulties that must be explained first. One is that in Eg. 2725, p. 144, it is initialed *T. C.*, and another is that in Shirley's 1646 edition, it lacks one verse. Against the latter we may set the fact that in Rawl. F 8, entitled *Verses and Poems by James Shirley*[1], it appears in full form. The Eg. MS. copy can be explained by supposing that it was taken from the 1640 edition of Carew's poems, which has already been shown to be untrustworthy[2]. But why Shirley should omit one verse is a mystery.

19. *Song,* 'Would you know what 's soft?' The case here is almost exactly the same as the preceding one, except that the two versions differ considerably in expression though not in thought. The Carew version occurs unattributed in Rawl. F 142, f. 28 and Eg. 2725, p. 135, as well as in the above-mentioned MS. collection of Shirley's poems, p. 6. The only possible solution here, since we must accept Shirley's statement that he wrote the poem, is to believe that he reworked it for the 1646 edition—certainly to its disadvantage.

20. *On his Mistress Looking in a Glass.* The second version of this poem, which does not appear in the early editions, is evidently the proper one from the fact that it occurs more frequently in the MSS. It may be found in Add. 21433, f. 145, and 25303, f. 161; Sloane 1446, f. 57. In the first two cases it is initialed *T. C.* and in the other *Th. C.* Vincent barely escapes the charge of omitting this poem altogether. He includes it only in the notes to his volume. The positions of the two versions should be reversed.

21. *Upon a Ribbon.* Our editors are right in considering the second version of this poem (copied by Hazlitt from the Cosens MS.) an inferior and probably earlier one. Vincent omits it altogether. The proper version occurs frequently in manuscript[3]; the other I have not found at all.

22. *A Paraphrase of Certain Psalms.* It is hardly fair of Vincent

[1] Collated by Dyce, *op. cit.*, VI, 402. See also *ibid.* 409 and 461.

[2] This explanation seems more than likely correct, for (1) the collection is later than 1640, since it contains a poem on the death of Laud (1645), and (2) it contains all three poems claimed by Shirley from Carew, which seems more than a mere coincidence.

[3] E.g. Add. 22602, f. 17, and 25303, f. 141; Harl. 3511, p. 52; also those mentioned by Hazlitt.

to omit these entirely with a mere note in connection with another poem that 'it is extremely improbable' that Carew was the author. They were accepted by Hazlitt and Ebsworth on the evidence at hand, and, although this is not altogether conclusive, it cannot be dismissed with a wave of the pen. The occurrence of *Psalm 104* in Add. 21433, f. 80, and 25303, f. 68, unattributed in both cases, has not yet been noted. *Psalm 137*[1] occurs in Add. 18220, f. 10, attributed to Lord Digby, Earl of Bristol. Further evidence on the whole problem is lacking, and at present no solution seems possible.

23. *Love's Flattery.* The name Celia caused Hazlitt to include this poem as possibly Carew's. No one has followed the lead here. A reading of contemporary printed and MS. poems reveals so many Celias that nothing can be fairly argued from the use of the name.

24. *Four Epigrams.* Hazlitt admitted these into his edition, without seriously questioning their authenticity, simply because they occur among poems by Carew in Harl. 6917. Ebsworth is nearer right in including them under protest. As a matter of fact, there is not the slightest evidence that they are by Carew. The case is this. The writer of the manuscript, being an excessively neat person, filled up all small spaces with epigrams. This is consistently done throughout the volume, and naturally some of these tags occur among Carew's poems. Since the authentic poems are ascribed to him and the epigrams are not, and since they do not resemble his style in any way, there can be no doubt that they are not his. Ebsworth suggests that Herrick may be the true author; so he may, and so may fifty others.

III. *New Poems.*

To the poems of Carew already known, I can add at least two and one stanza of a third which present claims worthy of consideration. It is to be regretted, however, that the poet's reputation may be somewhat lessened rather than increased by their acceptance.

1. *Upon the Royal Ship called the Sovereign of the Seas.*

> Triton's auspicious sound usher thy reign
> O'er the curled billows, Royal Sovereign,
> Monarchal ship, whose fabric doth outprize
> The Pharoes, Collosse, Memphis pyramids,

[1] Vincent's reference to *Psalm 107* (*op. cit.*, p. 258) is a misprint for *Psalm 137*.

And seems a moving tower, when sprightly gales
Quicken the motion and enbreathe the sails.
We that have heard of seven, now see the eighth
Wonder at home, of naval art the height.
This Britain Argo puts down that of Greece,
Bedecked with more than one rich golden fleece,
Wrought into sculptures which emblematize
Pregnant conceit to the more curious eyes.
Neptune is proud with burden, and doth wonder
To hear a four-fold fire outroar Jove's thunder.
Oh, then, triumphant ark, with Edgar's fame,
To Charles's scepter add [a] trident's claim.

This poem is found in Add. 34217, f. 29, a manuscript which is for the most part a collection of historical papers. It is subscribed by a different hand from the copyist's *Tho. Carew.* The style of the poem is certainly not suggestive of Carew, but until more evidence is discovered, it must be given a place in his work[1].

2. *Upon a Strumpet.*

Hail, thou true model of a cursed whore,
Damned by creation ever to be poor,
Though clothed in Italian silks or what may be
Bestowed in riot on thy venery.
Thou eldest daughter of the prince of night,
That canst outlie thy father at first sight,
Outscoff an Ismaelite, and attempt more
Than all our wicked age hath done before;
Nay, when the devil leaves, thou canst begin
And teach both him and us new ways to sin,—
Which makes me say that all our former times
Appear like poor pictures copied by thy crimes[2]—
etc. (24 more lines).

One is bound to omit the greater part of this unpleasant poem and one would gladly exclude it altogether from Carew's work, but it presents very good grounds for acceptance. It occurs in Ash. 38, art. 42; Add. 21433, f. 149; and 25303, f. 163; Harl. 6918, p. 177. All of these manuscripts contain well-known poems by Carew, and in both Add. MSS. it is subscribed *T. C.* and occurs among authentic poems all designated in the same way. Unwelcome as this poem may be, it is no more than one might expect from a man as selfish

[1] This ship, which was launched at Woolwich, June 17, 1637, was the subject of several panegyrics. Thos. Heywood wrote a small book on the occasion entitled *A true Description of His Majesties Royall Ship, etc.* (1637), which, beside a frontispiece of the ship, includes a short history of naval warfare, a description of the ship, and several poems in praise of it. Of the latter, Heywood himself and Shakerley Marmion were the authors. Henry King also celebrated the occasion with a poem, *A Salutation to His Majesty's Ship the Sovereign*, which may be found among his work. All these poems are similar in style, concept, and versification to Carew's.

[2] This text is made from a collation of all manuscripts. The punctuation is my own.

as Carew, when Celia refused to 'kiss and be kind'; and with certain others shows the justice of Clement Paman's contemporary characterization of its author:

> No lute nor lover durst contend with thee
> Hadst added to thy love but charity[1].

3. To the very popular song, 'Ask me no more where Jove bestows,' an extra stanza is added in Ash. 38, art. 95, and Eg. 2421, f. 9, as follows:

> Ask me no more whether north or south
> These vapours come from out thy mouth,
> For unto heaven they are sent hence
> And there are made Jove's frankincense.

The second couplet here is a close parallel to one in *The Comparison*, ll. 22–23. There can be little doubt that Carew is the author of the stanza, but whether he later wished it omitted from the poem is a question that cannot be decided[2].

This song of Carew's was so popular at the time that many similar ones were made by his contemporaries, some of them serious attempts at emulation and some parodies of a more or less humorous nature. The best known of these are printed in the appendix to Ebsworth's edition. Although Vincent says that they 'are all very poor stuff,' the one below, now for the first time printed, seems to me worthy of Carew himself. It occurs in Ash. 38, art. 180, but except for the style there is no evidence as to authorship.

> I still must ask thee where do stray
> The golden atoms of the day,
> For such powders would impair
> Not mend the beauty of thy hair.
>
> I still must ask thee where do light
> Those fiery bullets of the night,
> For in thine eyes, his proper sphere,
> The sun forbids the stars appear.
>
> I still must ask where Jove bestows,
> When June is past, the fading rose,
> For thy beauty's lasting spring
> Admitteth of no fading thing.
>
> I still must ask when May is past
> Whither doth Progne's sister haste,
> For in thy throat and breast there dwells
> No note so rude as Philomel's.

[1] Rawl. F 147, p. 108, entitled *To Tho. Carew*, now for the first time printed.

[2] In the MS. copies of this song there is no consistency whatever in the order of the stanzas. One of the variations is shown in the imitation given.

And I must ask what place partakes
The Phoenix' odors when she makes
Her death bed, for sure did she fly
To thee, she 'd live and multiply.

It would be possible to add many poems which occur in the midst of Carew's work in various manuscripts and which are much in his manner; but until there is better evidence than this for including them, it seems best to refrain from mentioning them, rather than risk making mistakes of the very kind I have been trying to correct.

C. L. Powell.

Baltimore, U.S.A.

RECENTLY RECOVERED MANUSCRIPTS AT ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

St John's College, Oxford, was, especially in the first half of the seventeenth century, one of the chief centres of academic drama, and MS. copies of a number of the plays acted there are still preserved in the College Library, the Bodleian, and the British Museum.

Through the kindness of Mr W. H. Stevenson, Fellow and Librarian of St John's, I am able to give a short account of three manuscripts which have recently been added to the College Library, and which I had an opportunity of examining during a recent visit to Oxford.

Two of these MSS. were discovered by chance in 1914 amongst legal documents in a lawyer's office in London. How they came to be there is not known, but as they were evidently the work of St John's men, the finders, with commendable public spirit, offered to deposit them, on certain conditions, in the College Library. They are both original Latin plays, and as they are bound in limp vellum, and tied with silk ribands, they have the appearance of presentation copies.

One of the MSS. is entitled *Mercurius siue Literarum Lucta.* It consists of 22 folios, written on both sides, and is signed at the end 'Joannes Blenkow.' This John Blencowe was born in London on 29 January, $160\frac{8}{9}$, and entered Merchant Taylors' School in 1621. Thence he proceeded to St John's, matriculating on 13 November, 1629[1], and graduating B.C.L. on 25 June, 1633. He was elected to a fellowship, and took orders. A copy of a sermon which he preached at St Paul's, *Michael's Combat with the Divel; or, Moses his Funerall* (1640), is in the British Museum.

The plot of *Mercurius*, though suggested by various classical episodes, is, so far as I am aware, original. Before the action opens Mercury, on his way back from the slaying of Argus, has procured from Hebe a draught of nectar for a maiden who has inspired him with

[1] This is the date given by J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, I, 138. The *D. N. B.* makes him enter Merchant Taylors' in 1620 and matriculate in 1627.

love. In the first scene Jupiter, furious at such a misuse of the drink of the Gods, banishes Mercury from Heaven.

While he is wandering disconsolate on earth he encounters Cupid who propounds a novel scheme by which he may secure his restoration to the abodes of bliss. The god of love undertakes to make the three Fates fall in love with Mercury. In a striking and amusing scene we are shown the infatuation of Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos who outvie one another in the endearments that they heap upon the exiled divinity. He pretends to reciprocate the passion of these ancient dames till he procures from them a promise that, to revenge his wrongs, they will thrust Jupiter down to Tartarus.

They are true to their word, and Jupiter is seen lamenting his overthrow among the shades. But Mercury having gained his end immediately throws off the mask, and in another scene full of somewhat acid humour, makes mock of the enamoured Fates. Stung by his insults they resolve to 'reverse their doom,' to restore Jupiter to his throne, and to send Mercury in his place to hell.

There is another striking scene in which Charon endeavours to overpower Mercury and to transport him in his bark. But the Ferryman of Styx has to acknowledge defeat. The Fates themselves cannot overcome one who as the deity of Letters has eternal vitality. But as they cannot rob Learning of immortality they take their revenge by coupling with it the gift of poverty. This ordinance, however, is blunted of its terrors, for Mercury turns to salute the buildings of St John's where Sir Thomas White has provided an asylum for the votaries of Letters.

Thus the play closes with a skilful compliment to the Founder of the College. There is no indication in the MS. of its having been acted, but with its variety of characters and scenes, its humours and surprises, it certainly looks as if it were written for the St John's stage. In any case it is a welcome addition to the list of extant academic plays.

The other Latin play, like *Mercurius*, consists of 22 folios written on both sides. The MS. has no title, but from its subject the play may be called *Cephalus et Procris*. Its author is Joseph Crowther, who afterwards attained considerable academic and ecclesiastical prominence. He was born about 1610 at Blackwall in Middlesex, entered St John's College, matriculating on 20 October, 1626, and was elected to a fellowship in 1628. He took the degrees of B.A. (1629), M.A. (1633), B.D. (163$\frac{8}{9}$) and D.D. (1660). He was Regius Professor of

Greek, 1660–5, and Principal of St Mary's Hall, 1664–89. He also obtained varied clerical preferment. He was appointed prebendary and precentor of St Paul's 1642, and was vicar of Great Dunmow, Essex, from 1640 to 1646. After the Restoration he became prebendary of Worcester, and rector of Tredington, co. Worcester. He was chaplain to James, Duke of York, and celebrated the midnight marriage between him and Anne Hyde on 3 September, 1660. In 1689 he had a quarrel with Sir Thomas Draper who procured his committal to the Fleet Prison, where he died on 16 December. He was buried in St Paul's.

Crowther's career shows that he must have been a man of varied gifts, and it is therefore interesting to recover a work from his pen. But *Cephalus et Procris* is a juvenile production. It is not dated, but the play is dedicated in a prefatory epistle to 'ornatissimo doctissimóq; viro Gulielmo Juxon,' President of the College and Vice-Chancellor of the University. Juxon, who became President of St John's in 1621, was Vice-Chancellor from 22 July, 1626, to 24 July, 1628. The congratulatory tone of the dedication suggests that it was written soon after Juxon's election, and Crowther speaks apologetically of his 'Academica infantia.' Hence there can be little doubt that *Cephalus et Procris* was written in his freshman's year, 1626–7. It is therefore not surprising to find that it treats the Ovidian story on conventional lines. A provisional examination of the play suggests that it has little claim to originality. A more detailed study may modify this impression, but, in any case, its interest will chiefly lie in its authorship and in the additional proof that it affords of Juxon's good-will towards academic drama.

The third manuscript added to the St John's library is connected with a greater name in dramatic annals than Blencowe or Crowther. When Alexander Dyce edited the works of George Peele in 1828 he included the blank-verse narrative poem *Polyhymnia*, which commemorates the tilting before the Queen on 17 November, 1590, the thirty-second anniversary of her accession, when Sir Henry Lee, the Master of the Armoury, resigned his office to the Earl of Cumberland. Dyce printed the poem from a slightly mutilated copy of the quarto edition of it issued in 1590–1. This copy had belonged to Drummond of Hawthornden, who had presented it to the library of the University of Edinburgh in 1626. Ten lines of it were missing or fragmentary. When Dyce published his second edition of Peele's works in 1829 he drew attention to the fact that *Polyhymnia* was now 'given complete;

the omissions having been supplied through the kindness of the Rev. Dr Bliss, from a MS. copy of the poem discovered in an old family mansion in Oxfordshire. Like other old transcripts of our early poetry, it presents several variations from the printed copy, which I have markt' (II, 192).

Dr Bliss was keeper of the University Archives from 1826 to 1857. Whether he personally owned the MS., 'discovered in an old family mansion in Oxfordshire,' which he allowed Dyce to collate is not clear. In any case the MS. seems to have afterwards disappeared, for when Mr Bullen published his edition of Peele in 1888 he did not quote the variants in *Polyhymnia* at first hand but from Dyce's notes[1]. The MS. must, however, have somehow found its way into the President's Lodgings at St John's, for when Dr Bellamy resigned office in 1909, it was discovered by chance by Mr Stevenson among other papers. It consists of seven folios, written on both sides, and seems to have been begun by one hand and completed by another.

As there is no other extant manuscript, so far as I know, of a work of Peele, the recovery of *Polyhymnia* in this form is a matter for congratulation. Dyce understated the case when he spoke of it as presenting 'several variations' from the printed copy. He himself records over forty, and as he used modernised spelling, he did not include differences of orthography. Any future editor of Peele will now have access to the MS. in the library of St John's, though Peele, of course, unlike Blencowe and Crowther, was not an *alumnus* of that college, but of Christ Church.

F. S. BOAS.

LONDON.

[1] Mr Bullen mentions a second copy of the quarto 'in the Duke of Devonshire's library' (II, 281), but does not say whether he collated it. Has this now gone to America with other Chatsworth treasures?

'PRÉCIOSITÉ' AFTER 'LES PRÉCIEUSES RIDICULES[1].'

III.

COMING now to the eighteenth century, I propose to consider how far the *préciosité* of its earlier years, of which we find indisputable evidence, was a survival, and how far it marked a new departure. Guided by our experience of the preceding century, we shall naturally turn in the first place to the *salon*, as the source and centre of *précieux* influence. As a matter of fact, two literary centres, one of which can hardly be called a *salon*, have been definitely charged with the encouragement of *préciosité*. These are the Court of Sceaux, where the Duc and Duchesse du Maine established themselves in 1700, and the *salon* of Mme de Lambert, the importance of which dates from about 1710.

The Duchesse du Maine was too much of a butterfly and a chatterbox to preside over a regular salon. Her object being to make Sceaux as lively as Versailles was dull, her entertainments were of the most varied description; lectures on the Cartesian philosophy, astronomy, the immortality of the soul, Greek tragedy, and Plato alternated with allegories, impromptus, songs, and comedies. But chief of all were the *Grandes Nuits*, or, as they were familiarly called, *Nuits blanches*, nocturnal entertainments in the park, of which the central piece was an allegorical play interspersed with music and dances[2]. The organiser of all these entertainments, the oracle on all questions of learning and science, the indefatigable purveyor of *esprit*, the great man, in short, of

[1] Continued from p. 176.

[2] See the *Memoirs* of Mme de Staal-Delaunay who became *femme de chambre* to the Duchess in 1711; Hamilton, *Œuvres*, III, 149–153 (for the account of a *fête* held in 1705); C. Hénault, *Mémoires*, ed. le Baron du Vigan, 1854, 112—121 (this edition is incomplete and incorrect; there is a new edition by F. Rousseau, 1911); Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, III, 206 ff.; Arvède Barine, *Princesses et grandes dames*, 3rd ed., 1893; G. Desnoiresterres, *Les Cours galantes*, 4 vols., 1859—1864, vol. IV; A. Jullien, *Les grandes nuits de Sceaux*.

Sceaux, was the Duke's former tutor, Nicolas de Malezieu[1], friend of Bossuet and Fénelon and Mme de Maintenon. His chief assistant was the Abbé Genest, a writer of tragedies and light verse, 'homme simple et vrai,' whose monstrous nose inspired endless jests without ruffling his imperturbable good humour[2]. Among the more favoured *habitués* were the Cardinal de Polignac, who had the reputation of being the best and most persuasive talker of his day[3], and who gave evidence of his scholarship and his Cartesianism in a much-admired Latin poem, *l'Anti-Lucrèce*; the Président de Mesmes; Jean-Baptiste de Valincour[4], the friend of Boileau and Racine, and the latter's successor in the Academy; the Marquis de Sainte-Aulaire, who having discovered when he was past sixty that he had a gift for writing *chansons*, was enrolled by the Duchess as her *berger*; and his fellow-poets of the Temple, the Abbé de Chaulieu and the Marquis de La Fare. Fontenelle was an occasional visitor in these days, but it was not till after the conspiracy of Cellamare (1718), when the Duchess's court had assumed the character of an ordinary salon, that La Motte and the President Hénault and Voltaire were added to her society.

According to Fontenelle it was the aim of the Duchess to introduce *esprit* into her entertainments (*que la joie eût de l'esprit*), and Malezieu, upon whom the main burden fell, dubbed them *les galères du bel esprit*. Now the constant search after *esprit* was one of the signs of *préciosité* in its early days, for, as Somaize says, a woman could not be a *précieuse* without either having *esprit*, or appearing to have it, or at least being persuaded that she had it[5], and what was true in Somaize's day held good forty years later. But, as Somaize is careful to point out, not every woman of *esprit* was a *précieuse*, and it is a question how far the Duchess, who, though capricious, frivolous, and superficial, was a woman of bright intelligence, comes under that category. Her conversation, at any rate, was remarkably free from affectation. 'Personne,' says Mme de Staal-Delaunay, an excellent and by no means friendly judge, 'n'a jamais parlé avec plus de justesse, de netteté et de rapidité, ni d'une manière plus noble et plus naturelle. Son esprit n'emploie ni

[1] Fontenelle, *Éloge de Malezieu*, *Œuvres*, VII, 252–61; the name is often wrongly written Malézieu. It was he who made to Voltaire, when he consulted him about his *Henriade*, the often quoted remark, 'Les Français n'ont pas la tête épique.' Voltaire describes him as 'homme qui joignait une grande imagination à une littérature immense.'

[2] Pellisson and Olivet, *Hist. de l'A. F.*, II, 369; D'Alembert, *Hist. des membres de l'Académie française*, III, 437 ff.

[3] Hénault, *Mémoires*, p. 116.

[4] For a favourable portrait see Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, II, 195.

[5] *Dict. des Précieuses*, ed. Ch. L. Livet, I, 23.

tours ni figures, ni rien de tout ce que s'appelle invention.' There is, however, one episode in her career which certainly seems to stamp her as a *précieuse* and which calls forth from Sainte-Beuve the exclamation, 'O Molière, le Molière des *Précieuses*, où étais-tu[1]?' This was the correspondence *en galanterie* which she carried on for three years (1726–29) with La Motte, when they were both past fifty[2]. But, after all, this episode need not be regarded as more than the freak of a spoilt child, who was always being bored and who was always looking out for some fresh source of entertainment.

A much fairer test of how far the society of Sceaux was affected by *préciosité* is afforded by the volume in which, under the title of *Divertissements de Sceaux* (1712)[3], the Abbé de Genest collected the occasional verse of himself and his fellow-toilers. The greater part of it is written by him and Malezieu, but there are a few pieces by Chaulieu, Mlle Delaunay, and others. The common theme is praise, not to say, adoration of the Duchess, but the tone and character of the verse are very different from those of the sentimental stanzas and sonnets of the true *précieux* salons. *Chansons* and *rondeaux* predominate, and the incense offered to the Duchess is seasoned with wit. Voiture is often the model, but there are also signs of the fashionable cult of Marot.

The character of this light verse is, in fact, much what we should expect from the literary tastes of its chief contributors. Malezieu and Saint-Genest might compose artificial trifles for the entertainment of their patroness, but they were very far from being *précieux* at heart. There was still less of the *précieux* about Chaulieu and La Fare and Sainte-Aulaire. There was, however, another guest at Sceaux, who figures in the same group with these in the *Temple du Goût*, and against whom the charge of *préciosité* has been definitely brought. This is the Irishman, Anthony Hamilton[4], who, foreigner though he was, has not only given a classic to French literature, but has had a certain influence upon the course of its development. For was not the author of the *Temple du Goût*, alike in his light verse, his tales, and his prose style, in some measure his disciple?

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 224.

[2] The correspondence is printed in La Motte's works. The first letters are quite sensible, but in La Motte's third letter the conventional tone of *galanterie* appears. See Desnoiresterres, *op. cit.*, IV, 217—236.

[3] A *Suite des divertissements* was published in 1726.

[4] 'Il fait de la préciosité trente ou quarante ans après qu'elle est morte à Paris' (E. Trolliet in *Hist. de la langue et de la litt. franç.*, V, 611).

Apart from his nationality, Hamilton is an interesting literary phenomenon. Educated in France in his boyhood, he returned to England in 1660 when he was fourteen, that is to say, too young to have acquired any definite literary tastes. At the Court of St James his friend and future brother-in-law, the Chevalier de Gramont, introduced him to Saint-Évremond, whose judgment on French literature carried great weight with the English courtiers and men of letters, and who contributed greatly to the formation of his taste[1]. Now Saint-Évremond, though possessed of a real critical gift, had a defect which often hampered its exercise. He was extremely prejudiced. Having been banished from France by Louis XIV, he looked with disfavour on nearly all the writers who made the reign of that monarch illustrious. Even Molière and La Fontaine, with whom he had much in common, he only tolerated; he was unjust to Racine, and he detested Boileau. His favourites were still the writers whom he had admired in his youth—Montaigne, Malherbe, Corneille, Voiture. It was, it may be conjectured, through Saint-Évremond that Hamilton was introduced to the writings of Voiture, to find in him a kindred spirit, frivolous, witty, and sociable. He also learnt to admire Voiture's rivals, Sarasin and Benserade, and even the ponderous Chapelain[2]. These were his literary gods; of the great writers of the succeeding generation he seems hardly to have heard. When he returned to France for good in 1690 to share the fortunes of the exiled king, he might have been asleep for thirty years, so far as French literature was concerned.

At the Court of Saint-Germain, the gloom of which he has feelingly depicted in one of his tales, he found a friend in the Duke of Berwick, and an occupation in writing verses and letters interspersed with verse, of which the most frequent recipients were Berwick and his sisters-in-law, Henrietta and Laura Bulkeley. It is very possible that in the combination of verse and prose which he affected he was following the illustrious example of La Fontaine, who had indulged in it for over thirty years, and who quite recently, at the end of 1687, had been engaged in a correspondence of this kind with Saint-Évremond.

The character of Hamilton's verse is much what one might expect from his choice of models. Though superior in quality, it differs little

[1] Note the part played by the shade of 'l'inimitable Saint-Évremond' in the *Épître à Gramont* (Hamilton, *Œuvres*, 3 vols., 1812), and for the influence of Saint-Évremond on Hamilton see W. M. Daniels, *Saint-Évremond en Angleterre*, Versailles, 1907, pp. 109—113.

[2] See *Épître à Gramont* and cp. a *Chanson* (*Œuvres*, III, 362), in which Sarasin and Benserade are coupled with Voiture.

in tone and sentiment from that which figures in the *Divertissements de Sceaux*, and it consists almost entirely of rhymed epistles, *rondeaux* 'after the manner of Voiture,' and *chansons*, of which one beginning,

Celle qui adore mon cœur n'est ni brune ni blonde,

is well known[1]. The merits of this verse are wit, gaiety, and charm; if it is too facile and too careless ever to reach a high level, it is too easy and too natural to be *précieux*.

Hamilton's prose has the same wit, gaiety, and charm, qualities which go further in prose than in verse, and as he gave more care to it than to his verse, it is considerably more important. M. Lanson in his *L'Art de la Prose* quotes a longish passage from *Fleur d'Épine*, Hamilton's most successful tale. Written about 1710, it is a good example of the delicate prose which foreshadowed the stronger weapon of Montesquieu and Voltaire. But it is impossible wholly to clear his prose—not indeed that of the tales so much as that of the *Mémoires de Gramont*—from the charge of *préciosité*. A passage taken almost at hazard will make this clear:

Elle[2] avoit entendu parler de Jermyn comme d'un héros d'amour. La Price, en lui contant les Aventures de Madame de Cléveland, en avoit souvent fait mention, sans rien diminuer de la foiblesse dont la renommée vouloit que ce héros se portât dans les rencontrées. Cela n'avoit pas empêché qu'elle n'eût la dernière curiosité de voir un homme dont la personne entière ne devoit être qu'un trophée mouvant des faveurs et des libertés du beau sexe.

Jermyn étoit donc venu satisfaire cette curiosité par sa présence; et quoiqu'on trouvât son brillant un peu rouillé du séjour de la campagne, que sa tête parût plus grosse et ses jambes plus menues qu'à l'ordinaire, la petite tête de Jennings crut n'avoir jamais rien vu de si parfait; et, cédant à sa destinée, la belle s'en laissa coiffer encore moins raisonnablement que les autres. On s'en aperçût avec quelque étonnement; car on attendoit quelque chose de plus de la délicatesse d'une personne jusqu'alors assez difficile.

There is no denying the *préciosité* of the last sentence of the first paragraph. It is one of those tasteless and grotesque metaphors which Molière ridicules[3]. 'Son brillant un peu rouillé du séjour de la campagne,' in the first sentence of the second paragraph, has also a decided touch of the same complaint.

[1] There are two or three serious pieces, of which one, *Réflexions*, shows real feeling.

[2] Frances Jennings, elder sister of Sarah; she married, first, George Hamilton, Anthony's brother, and, second, the Earl of Tyrconnel.

[3] The above passage was almost the first that presented itself. On re-reading Sainte-Beuve's article on Hamilton (*Causeries du Lundi*, I, 92 ff.), I found that he has called attention to the phrase at the close of the first paragraph as one of the two or three passages in the *Mémoires* which are 'not exempt from an appearance of effort' and are 'of equivocal taste.' 'The style, in general,' he says, 'is happy, natural, easy, and delicate, *sans rien de précieux*.' It is possible that the *trophée mouvant* may be the worst instance of downright bad taste, but it is not difficult to find passages in which from the use either of antithesis or of forced metaphor a straining after effect is plainly apparent.

The excuse, or, at any rate, the reason, is perhaps to be found in Voltaire's admirable judgment on the *Mémoires*, that they are 'de tous les livres celui où le fond le plus mince est paré du style le plus gai, le plus vif et le plus agréable[1].' It is apparently the necessity of continually dressing up this record of frivolity and scandal that compels Hamilton to seek in the *style figuré* a reinforcement for his natural *esprit*. This view finds support in the fact that the most entertaining part of the book, namely the chapters (II–V) which relate the adventures of the *chevalier* and his friend Matta at the siege of Trin and the Court of Turin, are entirely free from *préciosité*. At any rate, whatever affectation there may be in the style, the spirit of the book is the direct negation of the doctrines preached by the *précieuses*. No one could have said of the courtiers and ladies of the Court of Charles II, whose intrigues Hamilton chronicles with such evident relish, that they were 'the Jansenists of love.' When *la belle* Jennings, disguised as an orange-wench, resented Tom Killigrew's familiarities, he upbraided her for playing the *précieuse*[2].

The Court of Sceaux had, after all, little real influence on French literature. It was otherwise with the salon of Mme de Lambert[3]. Her salon is the first link in the long chain of literary salons or *bureaux d'esprit* which ended with that of Mme Necker on the very eve of the Revolution. It was no doubt consciously modelled on that of Mme de Rambouillet. Just as that illustrious lady, disapproving of the coarse conversation and free manners of the Court of Henry IV, had begun to receive her friends in her own house, so Mme de Lambert with similar aversion to the gambling and drinking, which were so rife in the latter days of the reign of Louis XIV, opened a salon in the Hôtel de Nevers, part of which she rented from the Duke, for rational conversation and the discussion of serious subjects. For in recent years the salons of the nobility had been more or less closed to men of letters, who in default had resorted for company and conversation to the newly instituted *cafés*[4]. By the year 1710 Mme de Lambert's salon was definitely organised, and two days of the week, Tuesdays and Wednesdays, were dedicated to the reception of her friends, the Tuesdays being distinctly literary and scientific, and the Wednesdays chiefly social

[1] *Le siècle de Louis XIV*.

[2] For Hamilton see G. Saintsbury, *Essays on French Novelists*, 1891.

[3] Anne-Thérèse de Marguenat de Courcelles (1647—1733) married the Marquis de Lambert in 1666, and was left a widow in 1686.

[4] The famous *café* Procope was opened near the *Comédie française* in 1690; by 1715 there were 300 *cafés* in Paris.

But there was no rigid demarcation. The *gens du monde* who cared for literature or science were perfectly welcome on a Tuesday. On both days the general reception was preceded by a dinner-party at twelve o'clock, to which the hostess's more intimate friends were invited. Before long her salon acquired great influence in the intellectual world. Her interest was recognised as a passport to the Academy. She was known as *la grande électrice*, and it was said at her death that half of the then existing members owed their election to her[1]. Moreover, the connexion with her salon brought to the Academy an increased reputation, and gave it a bent towards philosophy rather than, as hitherto, towards literature. It may be said with truth that the eighteenth century became conscious of itself in the salon of Mme de Lambert.

The charge of *préciosité* that has been brought against her and against her salon comes in the first instance from her contemporaries. Lesage satirised her in *Gil Blas* under the name of the Marquise de Chaves, whose house at Salamanca was known as 'le bureau des ouvrages d'esprit[2],' and he repeated the attack with more good nature twenty years later in *Le Bachelier de Salamanque* (1736)[3]. 'Elle se livra au public, elle s'associa à Messieurs de l'Académie, elle établit chez elle un bureau d'esprit[4].' This was the grievance which her old friend M. de Rivière, the son-in-law of Bussy-Rabutin, had against her, and on which he dwells with wearisome iteration in his letters. He adds that he did everything he could to save her from the ridicule which is attached to the profession of *Bel esprit*, especially when practised by women, and that, having failed, he did not set foot in her house for twenty-four years. It is clear, however, from these and other references to Mme de Lambert in his letters that La Rivière, who was spending his declining years in the retirement of a religious house, was strongly prejudiced against authors and especially against female authors. For it was an additional crime in his eyes that Mme de Lambert had published a book.

It is true that she had done this almost *malgré elle*. When her *Réflexions nouvelles sur les Femmes* was printed without her permission in 1727, she did her best to suppress it[5]. It was because of an

[1] D'Argenson, *Journal et Mémoires*, I, 163–4. See for Mme de Lambert and her salon, Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, IV, 217 ff.; Ch. Giraud in *Journal des Savants*, 1880, pp. 112 ff.; Desnoiresterres, *op. cit.*, vol. IV; and the notice prefixed to *Œuvres morales de la M^ise de Lambert*, ed. M. de Lescure, 1883.

[2] Book IV, c. 8 (this part was published in 1715).

[3] c. LXII; Mme de Lambert was now dead.

[4] *Lettres choisies* de M. de La Rivière, 2 vols., 1751, II, 205. Sainte-Beuve quotes the passage. Cp. also *ib.*, 287—291.

[5] *Réflexions nouvelles sur les Femmes* par une Dame de la cour. Paris, 1727. Nouv. édition corrigée, Londres, 1730.

unauthorised publication of her *Avis à son Fils* and in order to forestall a similar publication of her *Avis à sa Fille* that she published the two together in 1728[1]. Her writings are remarkable for their sanity and good sense no less than for their insight. In the *Réflexions* she declares that Molière had done harm by his *Femmes savantes*, and she asks whether society has gained by the substitution of debauchery for learning and of indecency for *préciosité*, a question which was a highly pertinent one at the close of the seventeenth century. Both the *Avis* are remarkable for their elevated tone and just insight into character. That addressed to her son, who became highly distinguished as a general, is a singularly noble performance. The definition of *Honnêteté* as 'une préférence des autres à soi,' as opposed to *Amour-propre*, which is 'une préférence de soi aux autres,' is a happy corollary to La Rochefoucauld. In the *Avis à sa Fille* the same social virtue is defined as 'une imitation de la Charité.'

The *quelque affectation de précieux* that D'Argenson[2] found in Mme de Lambert's style is certainly not perceptible to a foreigner. Indeed if you judge it as a whole, no one can fail to be struck by its directness and simplicity and by the pregnant brevity of its sentences. Here and there may be found certain novelties of expression, which gave offence to contemporary purists, but Sainte-Beuve successfully defends these as the result of Mme de Lambert's endeavour to express her thought with exactness and propriety. Similar reproaches are invariably made against all innovators in language, but without them style would crystallise and petrify. As a matter of fact it was the French Academy's excessive conservatism which led to the prose of the eighteenth century becoming so dry and monotonous.

To pass from Mme de Lambert's writings to the frequenters of her salon, there was certainly nothing *précieux* in D'Argenson, who was a regular attendant for fifteen years. Nor was there in his fellow-member of the Club de l'Entresol, the Abbé de Saint-Pierre, who had been introduced to Mme de Lambert by Fontenelle some years before her

[1] *Avis d'une Mère à son Fils et sa Fille.* Paris, 1728. The three treatises are all included in an Amsterdam edition of 1732, the two latter under the title of *Lettres sur la véritable éducation.* M. de Lescure's edition (see above) contains also *Traité de l'Amitié* and *Traité de la Vieillesse.* There have been several English translations of Mme de Lambert's writings—of the *Réflexions* by F. Lockman in 1729 and 1737; of the two *Avis* by W. Hatchet (London, 1729; Dublin, 1731), T. Carte (1737), Rowell (1749), and A. Haggard (1885); of her *Traité de l'Amitié* and *Traité de la Vieillesse* in 1780; and of her *Œuvres* in 1770 (Dublin) and 1771 (London). From internal evidence we know that the *Avis à son Fils* was written about 1701, and from a letter to Fénelon it would appear that the *Avis à sa Fille* was written in 1709.

[2] *Mémoires*, I, 163.

salon became famous. On the other hand the President Hénault, in the *entresol* of whose hotel the meetings of the club took place, had in his younger days a decided touch of *préciosité*, being a *bel esprit* after the manner of Fontenelle, for whom he had a warm admiration[1]. But his *préciosité* was in reality little more than a veneer, and in matters of gallantry the friend of Mme Du Deffand was a true eighteenth-century type. He found Mme de Lambert 'un peu apprêtée; elle n'avait pas eu la force de franchir, comme Mesdames de Sévigné et de La Fayette, les barrières du collet monté et du précieux[2].'

One of Mme de Lambert's oldest and most intimate friends was Louis de Sacy[3], the translator of Pliny's *Letters* (1699–1701), a man whose sterling character, amiable disposition, and polished urbanity, would have made the fortune of any salon. His style has been accused of affectation, but it is exactly suited to Pliny's silver Latinity. A still warmer place in Mme de Lambert's heart was reserved for Sainte-Aulaire, who was about her own age, and whose son was married to her daughter. 'Elle ne connut d'autre passion qu'une tendresse constante et presque platonicienne,' says D'Argenson, and Sainte-Beuve suggests that the object of this friendship was Sainte-Aulaire, who, when he was weary of pulling an oar in the *galères* of Sceaux, came to find repose in his old friend's salon.

> Je suis las de l'esprit, il me met en courroux,
> Il me renverse la cervelle;
> Lambert, je viens chercher un asile chez vous
> Entre La Motte et Fontenelle.

These lines are a little surprising, for there can be no doubt that it is largely owing to Fontenelle and La Motte that Mme de Lambert's salon has acquired its character for *préciosité*[4]. Fontenelle was its great man, its oracle, while La Motte was regarded by his hostess with an even more lively admiration. A portrait of him from her pen is hyperbolical in its praise[5]. In these views she was in agreement with the general verdict, for the pair were regarded by their contemporaries as men of universal genius. 'C'est l'esprit le plus universel que le siècle de Louis XIV ait produit' is Voltaire's estimate of Fontenelle.

It must be remembered that when the latter began to exercise intellectual sway in Mme de Lambert's salon, he was in a very different

[1] D'Argenson has drawn a sympathetic portrait of him, which is quoted by Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, XI, 218.
[2] *Mémoires*, p. 103.
[3] 1654—1727. See D'Alembert, *op. cit.*, I, 211 ff.
[4] Cp. Lanson, *Choix de lettres du XVIII^e siècle*, p. 6.
[5] *Œuvres* de La Motte, 1754, I, 2.

position from that which he held at the time of La Bruyère's portrait. Then he was only known as a comparatively young and successful man of letters. In 1710 he was over fifty; for more than ten years he had been the perpetual secretary of the reconstructed *Académie des Sciences*, and he had already published the first instalment of his famous *Éloges des Académiciens* (1708), in which, in language purged of all *préciosité*, he revealed to the world the width of his scientific knowledge and his incomparable faculty for lucid exposition. Whether or no he had taken to heart the criticisms contained in La Bruyère's portrait, he had from the date of its publication practically abandoned the fields of poetry and drama[1], and had devoted himself to the work for which he was preeminently fitted, that of annexing to literature the new domain of science. It was no longer the *bel esprit* but the *philosophe* who compelled the admiration of his contemporaries.

It is this double character of *bel esprit* and *philosophe* that is noticeable in Fontenelle, and that distinguishes him from an ordinary *précieux* of an older generation. La Bruyère's Cydias is no doubt an accurate portrait as far as it goes, but it is unfair because it is incomplete. It speaks, indeed, of Fontenelle's *philosophie* as well as of his *esprit*, but it shows no understanding of this side of his intellectual character. The fact is that when La Bruyère wrote it the attitude implied by the terms *philosophe* and *philosophie* was a new one, which did not fully develop till the next century. A *philosophe* at the beginning of the eighteenth century was a man who did not accept the dogmas of authority and tradition, but who examined all questions by the light of reason, and by the application of the Cartesian method. 'Le bel esprit sur un fond solide, juste, et pensé, semble être le caractère de ce siècle;...et en cela il est vrai que M. de Fontenelle a donné le ton à son siècle[2].'

Even in his earlier writings, even in *Les lettres galantes*, with its ominous title, which was not, however, the original one, the purely *précieux* element has been exaggerated. '[Elles] sont le plus souvent du pur Benserade,' says M. Faguet, but the *feux* and the *flammes*, the *appas* and the *attraits* of Benserade's day have disappeared. The ladies

[1] He still wrote dramas (chiefly comedies), but they were only read in salons, and were not printed till 1751.

[2] L'Abbé Trublet, *Essais sur divers sujets de littérature et de morale*, 4 vols., 1735–60, IV, 23. The chief authority for Fontenelle's life is the same writer's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de M. de Fontenelle*, 2nd ed., Amsterdam, 1759. Trublet (1697—1770) has gained an unenviable notoriety from Voltaire's well-known lines in *Le pauvre diable*, but his life of Fontenelle contains much useful and interesting information, and his *Essais* reflect with sobriety and common sense the ideas of his day. See also L. Maigron, *Fontenelle*, 1906, and A. Laborde-Milaâ, *Fontenelle*, 1905.

are no longer cruel, the lovers no longer languish. 'The languishing attitude has its uses,' says the Count, 'but it is fatal to be always languishing.' 'Women would rather be amused without being loved than loved without being amused[1].' When he sends *Le Grand Cyrus* as a present to a young girl in a convent-school, he accompanies it with the advice that she must not expect from her lovers all the virtues of Artamène, and especially not that exaggerated respect which he had for his mistress[2]. This is the tone not of Mme de Scudéry but of the eighteenth century. The same tone predominates in the *Dialogues des Morts*, published in the same year, for though several of the dialogues deal with *questions galantes* after the manner of the *précieux ruelles*, the speaker who upholds the *précieux* or spiritual theory of love nearly always gets the worst of the argument. It is true that there is a perpetual display of *esprit* in the *Lettres galantes* and that it is often in such execrable taste that La Bruyère might have said to the author, as he says to Acis, the *diseur de phébus*, 'Une chose vous manque, c'est l'esprit.' But the *esprit* is displayed much more in the ideas than in the language. Three years later, in the *Histoire des Oracles* (1686), Fontenelle brought almost to perfection 'the short, dry, nervous, broken phrase' of the eighteenth century, 'which seems to address itself only to the intelligence[3].' Moreover, although throughout his life he always remained an *homme de salon*, finding in society that happiness which he cultivated with such assiduity, and though he never quite lost his love of *esprit* and points and fantastic comparisons, he was, as has been said, a very different person in 1710 from what he had been a quarter of a century earlier.

Antoine Houdar de La Motte[4] began his literary career, like Fontenelle, by writing librettos for operas, and his first attempt, which bore the significant title of *L'Europe galante* (1697), had a great success. Like Fontenelle, again, he came to be regarded as an *esprit universel*, but he confined his universality to literature. It is almost literally true that there was not a single department of poetry in which he did not show facility, though of all that he wrote not a single line has survived. With more feeling than his friend and master, he was equally devoid of imagination. 'C'est dommage,' said Boileau of him, 'qu'il ait été

[1] *Lettre* xxiii. [2] 2*de partie*, *lettre* vii. See Maigron, *op. cit.*, pp. 134—147.
[3] G. Lanson, *L'Art de la Prose.*
[4] 1672—1731. Trublet has inserted in his Memoirs on Fontenelle an article on La Motte (for whom he entertained a warm regard), written by the Abbé Goujet and revised by himself, for the *Grand Dictionnaire* of Moreri. D'Alembert has an interesting comparison between Fontenelle and La Motte (*op. cit.*, vol. i). See also P. Dupont, *Un poète-philosophe au commencement du XVIII^e siècle, Houdar de La Motte*, 1898.

s'encanailler de Fontenelle[1],' for in the eyes of Boileau, whom he admired and with whom he was on friendly terms, it was through Fontenelle that he became infected with *préciosité*. But though La Motte's *préciosité* was of the same modified type as his master's, his correspondence with the Duchesse du Maine shows that he could write in the true *précieux* style with his usual facility. But his ordinary prose, the prose of his critical discourses, by which alone he is known to posterity, is entirely free from affectation. Nor can it be said that his verse, at least in his more ambitious attempts, such as his Odes, suffers from a similar complaint. It is unutterably prosaic, but it is not in the least *précieux*[2].

What more than anything else gave Fontenelle and La Motte the reputation with their contemporaries of being high priests of a new *précieux* movement was the influence they had acquired in salons of literary pretensions. 'Fade discoureur, qui n'a pas mis plus tôt de pied dans une assemblée qu'il cherche quelques femmes auprès de qui il puisse s'insinuer,' says La Bruyère in his portrait of Cydias. The salon of Mme de Lambert was regarded as a revived Blue Chamber and Fontenelle and La Motte as successors to Voiture. And contemporary opinion was so far right. In the importance attached to *esprit* and urbanity, in the encouragement of conversation on serious topics, the new salon closely resembled the old. But it was unfair to charge the Hôtel de Rambouillet with *préciosité*. The germs of it were no doubt there, and in the last few years of its career they began to develop. But after all—and this cannot be insisted on too often—the word *précieuse* did not come into vogue till after the Fronde, when the Blue Chamber had ceased to have any importance. In spite of the Dictionary of Somaize, Mme de Rambouillet and the great majority of her guests were not *précieuses*. The first true *précieuse* was Mlle de Scudéry, and, as is clearly shown by the difference in tone between *Le Grand Cyrus* (1649–1653) and *Clélie* (1654–1660), she did not become so till the days of her own salon[3]. It was here that were fully developed the high-flown

[1] Trublet, *Mémoires*, p. 40; he adds that when he repeated this to Fontenelle, 'lui de rire, ou plutôt de sourire; car il avouoit qu'il n'avait jamais ri ni pleuré, mais il sourioit souvent et bien naturellement.'

[2] *Odes de M. de La Motte. Avec un discours sur la Poësie en général, et sur l'Ode en particulier*, Amsterdam, 1707; *Odes et autres ouvrages de M. de La Motte*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1711 (a new edition, augmented).

[3] I have stated this view at greater length in *From Montaigne to Molière*, 1905, pp. 206—209. M. Fidaõ-Justiniani in his *L'esprit classique et la préciosité au XVII^e siècle*, starting from the premise that Mme de Rambouillet and her friends were *grandes précieuses* and *grands précieux*, argues that *préciosité* was an integral part of the *esprit classique*. But does not this conclusion suggest that his premise is faulty?

sentimentality, the excessive prudery, the love of mutual admiration, the dabbling in authorship, the cult of novelty and paradox that marked the true *précieuse*. Some of these characteristics, no doubt, lasted into the eighteenth century and were fostered by salon-leaders like Fontenelle and La Motte. *Esprit* was still the aim of talkers and writers, and novelty in language and paradox in thought were cultivated more carefully than ever. But curiosity was no longer philological, but philosophical; it was no longer concerned with words but with ideas. Reason drove out imagination. *Bel esprit* joined hands with *philosophie*. Above all there was a marked difference in the attitude towards women. In public there was even an increase in regard for *les bienséances*, but 'Jansenism in love' was a thing of the past. Men like D'Argenson and the President Hénault made love after the manner of the Regency. Nor were some of the women who had the *entrée* to Mme de Lambert's salon of more austere virtue. Mme de La Force, the authoress of fairy-tales and numerous 'romans historiques et galants,' had on account of her scandalous life been condemned to spend eleven years in a convent. The Comtesse de Murat, another writer of novels and fairy-tales, had spent thirteen years in 'retreat' in the *château* of Loches, only being released on the death of Louis XIV through the influence of Mme de Parabère, the Regent's mistress[1].

But when one has duly distinguished between the old *préciosité* and the new, and when one has made allowance for the exaggeration of a Lesage, who hated a *précieux* hardly less than a financier, or an honest *gaulois* like Matthieu Marais[2], the fact remains that during the first third of the eighteenth century *préciosité* in some form or another was

[1] For these ladies see the *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* and F. Brunetière, *Études critiques*, v, 204–10.

[2] 'Ce bel esprit qui protège les beaux esprits du nouveau style' (*Journal et Mémoires*, I, 144, written in 1725). Brunetière's account of Mme de Lambert and her salon is warped by prejudice. I quote the first half of a typically long sentence, which is composed of 147 words: 'La marquise de Lambert, au palais Mazarin, locataire, voisine et amie du duc de Nevers, le protecteur déclaré de Pradon contre Racine, amie plus intime encore du Marquis de Sainte-Aulaire, l'ennemi particulier de Boileau, goûtant elle-même très-médiocrement Molière, et—qui sait?—trouvant peut-être les *Fables* de La Motte supérieures à celles de La Fontaine, tient école de marivaudage...' (*Études critiques*, III, 128). It is true that Mme de Lambert rented part of the Duc de Nevers's *hôtel*, but there is no evidence that she was a friend of his. It is true that Boileau strongly resented Sainte-Aulaire's election to the Academy on the ground that he was merely a song-writer, but there is no evidence that Sainte-Aulaire was Boileau's 'special enemy.' It is true that Mme de Lambert pleads the cause of female education against Molière in *Les Femmes savantes*, but it does not follow that she failed to appreciate him as a writer of comedy. As to her thinking La Motte's *Fables* superior to La Fontaine's, this is a pure conjecture. The rest of the sentence characterises the style affected by Mme de Lambert and the *habitués* of her salon in terms borrowed from Lesage. But Mme de Lambert's style may be judged better from her writings than from the attacks of a writer who had never set foot in her salon.

recognised by men of sound taste and understanding as a dangerous element in French society and literature, which had to be combated by censure and ridicule. This danger, however, chiefly affected the language, and in this connexion it is pertinent to quote a passage from Voltaire's summary of *Les Précieuses ridicules*, written in 1733; 'L'envie de se distinguer a ramené depuis le style des précieuses: on le retrouve dans plusieurs livres modernes.' And then he proceeds to give three examples—from Jacques de Tourreil's *Essais de jurisprudence* (1694), from Fontenelle's *Lettres galantes* (1683) and from La Motte's *Fables* (1719). Two of these, it will be noticed, were already of fairly ancient date when Voltaire wrote, and the expression which he quotes from Tourreil's *Essais* was omitted in the new edition which the Abbé Massieu published in 1721 after the author's death (1715), with a preface saying that the author had corrected 'ce qui avait choqué les personnes de bon goût[1].' Voltaire adds that the *précieux* style 'has reappeared even in the drama, where Molière ridiculed it with such effect.' This, of course, is a hit at Marivaux, but the question of Marivaux's style, and whether it is the offspring of *préciosité*, or whether, as he himself maintained, it was the sincere expression of his thought, is too large a one to be discussed at the end of an article which has become already too long.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

[1] *Œuvres de Molière*, ed. Despois and Mesnard, II, 46.

MADAME DE STAËL, H. C. ROBINSON ET GOETHE.

Je n'ai pas l'intention de revenir sur les relations personnelles qui unirent, à Weimar, Madame de Staël, H. C. Robinson et Goethe. Je veux simplement apporter ici, à l'appui de mes précédents articles[1], quelques documents inédits ou inconnus.

H. C. Robinson fit connaître à Madame de Staël, non seulement les philosophes, mais encore les poètes allemands. Il écrivit pour elle des dissertations sur la 'métaphysique nouvelle,' et c'est d'abord par ses traductions et ses commentaires qu'elle connut les poésies lyriques de Goethe. Sur la demande de Boettiger, il lui avait prêté, dès le début de janvier 1804, ses notes sur les cours de Schelling. Voici une lettre qu'il lui envoya d'Iéna, le 24 janvier[2]. Elle fait allusion à des discussions antérieures et permet de préciser les souvenirs flottants du *Diary*, d'avancer la date de leur première entrevue[3]. Robinson y annonce à la baronne l'envoi de quelques poésies de Goethe, traduites en anglais par lui-même : *Prométhée*, *Ganymède*, et *l'Amour peintre de paysage.*

A Madame
Madame de Stähl (sic)

Jena 24th January 1804.

If you wonder at my assurance, Madam, you will also admire my zeal, which at the risk of exposing myself, leads me to present you with a few poetical translations from the great poet of whom I might say as Ben Johnson said of Shakespeare, I honour him on this side *Idolatry.*

[1] *Rev. Hist. Lit.*, Juil.—Sept. 1912, pp. 539–46, et *Rev. de Métaphysique*, Janv. 1914.

[2] Cette lettre inédite se trouve aux Archives de Coppet et m'a été aimablement communiquée par Monsieur le Comte d'Haussonville qui m'a autorisé à la publier.

[3] Dans son *Diary*, Robinson fixe au 28 janvier sa première visite à Madame de Staël (ed. 1872, I, p. 92).

I should not have dared to do this had I not remarked your partiality for the English language. This circumstance alone can render my copies tolerable, for though you may not be versed enough in the German to feel all the inimitable beauties of the original, you are too acute a critic in the English, not to perceive the deformities of my Imitations.

I flatter myself that your deeply reflecting mind will be gratified by the two metaphysical odes displaying the embodied principles of Impiety and Devotion. The one is the stoical epicurean, the heroic atheist, who contemplates the evils of nature with indignation, who sees nowhere a good principle, but he is above suffering for he feels his own strength. The other is a genuine platonist, one whose love towards the Absolute *leads to the extinction of all personality. The finite soul longs to be absorbed by the Infinite.*

You will find too an erotic allegory. How naïve the description! how sweetly fanciful the fiction! And to mitigate the severity with which you treat the religion of fancy, I have copied a fragment from Schiller. The argument is at least ad hominem.

I should say, I have had the ill luck *to differ from you on many points of sentiment and opinion, if with you we were not interested in this difference, for the sake of your instructions. But when I shall no longer have this enjoyment, I should wish to make a compromise with you. The terms are fair. Do but love the German poets, and I will give up the Philosophers.*

I have the honour to remain (and I am writing English)

Your profound admirer

H. C. Robinson.

J'ai retrouvé, dans les papiers de H. C. Robinson, les traductions mentionnées ici. Elles furent d'ailleurs publiées, en 1802 et 1803, par le *Monthly Register*, les deux premières avec un commentaire dont Robinson se souvint en écrivant à Madame de Staël[1].

Prometheus and *Ganymede* may be considered as personified Impiety and Devotion. The lover and the hater of the Gods are antithetically displayed. Prometheus, more noble and heroic, and more entitled to our sympathy than Milton's Satan, proudly and triumphantly avows his contempt of the thunderer; he bids defiance to Jupiter, and swears to perpetuate his hatred against him, in the minds of the men he had created. Ganymede's Song is one stream of love, longing, burning love.

[1] *Monthly Register*, 1803, II, p. 297.

1. Prometheus[1].

Cover thy heaven, Jove,
With cloudy vapour
And, like the boy
Who cuts down thistles,
Show thy strength on oaks
And mountain tops.
Thou can'st not touch
My earth, the cottage
Which thou hast not built,
And this my hearth
Whose glow thou enviest me.

I know nothing poorer
Under the sun
Than you, ye Gods.
You nourish sparingly
With smoke of sacrifice
And breath of prayer
Your majesty.
And you would starve
If children, beggars,
Were not hoping fools.

When I was a child
And nothing knew
I turn'd my puzzled eye
To the sun, as if above
An ear were that would
Listen to my sufferings,
And a heart like mine
To pity the oppress'd.

Who aided me
Against the Titans' rage?
Who rescued me
From Death and slavery?
Was it not thou alone
Thou holy glowing heart?
Thou, young and loving, glow'dst
Deceiv'd, with grateful warmth,
For yonder sleeper.

I honour thee? And why?
Hast thou the pains assuag'd
Of the afflicted?
Hast thou the tears e'er quench'd
Of the tormented?
Was I not form'd to Man
By mighty Time
And Destiny eternal,
Thy lords and mine?

Thou think'st perhaps
That I shall scorn my life,
And fly in wastes
Because not all
The dream'd blossoms ripen?

Here I sit and form
Men like myself;
A race like me
To suffer and to weep
And have enjoyment
And to despise
As I do, thee!

2. Ganymede.

As in the morning sun
Thou doest glow round me,
Spring, thou beloved.
Love's Joy, thousandfold
Presses upon my heart
Feeling most holy
Of thy eternal warmth,
Definite beauty.

O, that this longing arm
Could but embrace thee!
Ling'ring I'm lying
Upon thy bosom,
Whil'st thy own perfumes
And thy own verdure
Press on my heart.
And thou, sweet morning breeze,

Coolest the burning
Thirst of my bosom.
Hark, too! the nightingale
Loving does call me
Out of the misty vale.
Oh! come, I come
Whither? ah, whither?

Upwards! it upwards strives,
Clouds are descending,
Downwards are hovering,
Bend towards longing love,
Bend towards me.
Upwards, within thy lap,
Clasping and claspen,
Upwards, and in thy breast,
All loving Father!

Prométhée et *Ganymède* sont, comme on le voit, traduits en vers libres qui essaient de reproduire le rythme de l'original. *L'Amour*

[1] La seule de ces trois traductions qui ait déjà été reproduite. (G. Herzfeld, *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, xxx, 1909, pp. 218 f.)

peintre de paysage, d'une forme plus classique, est aussi, comme l'original, un poème en vers trochaiques sans rimes.

CUPID AS LANDSCAPE PAINTER.

Early, on the rock's bare summit
I with fixèd eyes was looking
On the fog, which like grey canvas
Kept all things around conceal'd.
Came a boy, stood by my shoulder,
Said, 'Why friend art thou thus staring
Coldly on the empty canvas;
Hast thou lost all joy in painting,
Lost thy love of art forever?'
Looking on the boy, I whisper'd
'Will that child, too, play the master?'
'Mournfully and idly sitting,'
Said the boy, 'will profit nothing;
See, I'll make at once a picture,
I will teach thee how to paint, too.'
And he stretched his fore-finger
—Like a rose-bud it was glowing—
On the wide outstretched canvas,
With the tip of his finger drawing,
On the top a sun he painted,
In my eyes it brightly glitter'd,
And the clouds had golden borders.
Through the clouds the sun-beams glided.
Then the trees' light tops he painted,
Trees of heart-enlivening freshness,
And a group of distant mountains
Gently rose above each other.
And below a stream was flowing
So like nature, that the river
Seem'd to sparkle in the sun-beams,
And to beat against the borders.
Flowers, too, were in the river.
Colours sparkled in the meadow,
Gold, and green, and blue, and purple,
Look'd like emeralds and rubies.
To the sky he then proceeded,
Light and clear and bright he made it,
And the blue hills in the distance.
I was lost in joy, beholding
Now the painting, now the painter.
'Have not I,' said he, 'now proved
That I understand my business,
But the best is still remaining.'
Then he drew with pointed finger,
By the wood, with utmost niceness,
Where the sun with might was shining
—From the bright soil was reflected—
There he drew the sweetest maiden
Neatly clad and finely formed,
Fresh cheeks, under auburn ringlets,
And her cheeks were of the colour
Of the finger which had drawn her.
'O thou boy,' I cried, 'what master
Has taught thee so wise a lesson,

That with such skill and such nature
Thou couldst plan and end the picture?'
And behold, as I was speaking,
Rises softly a faint zephyr,
Gently blows the trees' high branches,
Curls the waves upon the river,
Fills the veil of the sweet maiden;
And, which sets me more in wonder,
She, the maiden, is in motion,
To the spot she is approaching
Where the boy and I are sitting.
As all things were now in motion,
Trees and river, veil and flowers,
And the soft foot of the maiden,
Dost thou think now that I idly
Rock-like, on my rock remain'd?

Quelles que soient les réserves qu'on a le droit de faire sur la qualité poétique de cette traduction, j'ai cru devoir la citer en entier pour reconstituer l'envoi de Robinson à Madame de Staël. Outre cet intérêt d'ordre biographique, ces trois versions de Goethe ont d'ailleurs un intérêt chronologique : elles sont les premières transpositions en anglais de ces poèmes. Le fragment traduit de Schiller, dont il est question dans la lettre, n'a malheureusement ni une grande valeur littéraire, ni même ce mérite historique. C'est la touchante scène des *Piccolomini*, où Max et Thécla s'entretiennent sur la beauté du ciel et la mystérieuse signification des astres[1]. Robinson traduit en vers blancs cet éloquent dialogue, et il l'intitule : 'An apology for sentimental superstition in astrology.' Mais le magnifique *Wallenstein* de Coleridge (1800) éclipse l'honnête tentative de Robinson. Quant à Madame de Staël, elle l'oublia rapidement : l'adaptation de Benjamin Constant (1809) effaça sans peine, dans son esprit, la modeste page de Robinson[2].

Celui-ci lui communiqua encore ses traductions des *Xénies* et des *Épigrammes Vénitiennes*. Sans grand succès, car elle s'intéressait plus aux ballades romantiques et ne comprenait pas, dit-il, 'les épigrammes les plus exquises.' Elle-même lui soumettait en revanche ses propres traductions. L'avis, toujours franc, de son ami lui était précieux. Un jour qu'elle lisait à ses invités sa version de la *Fiancée de Corinthe*, elle recueillit les compliments les plus flatteurs. Robinson seul se taisait. 'Et vous, Robinson, vous ne dites rien?'—'Madame,' lui répondit-il, 'je me demande si vous avez compris le véritable sens des mots.' Et il relut, à haute voix, le passage de Goethe dont il suspectait la traduction. Boettiger prit la défense de Madame de Staël, mais celle-ci réfléchit, saisit son erreur et remercia Robinson.

JEAN-MARIE CARRÉ.

PARIS.

[1] *Piccolomini*, Acte III, Sc. 4.
[2] Madame de Staël cite et commente *Walstein* dans *l'Allemagne*.

DEUTSCHE PROSAFRAGMENTE DES XII. JAHRHUNDERTS.

II.

Bruchstücke der sogenannten Practica des Meister Bartholomæus.

1. Diese Fragmente bilden nun—ihrer richtigen Folge nach gezählt—die zweite und erste Hinter- und die Vorderkustode der Papier-Handschrift Misc. Liturg. 334 der Bodleiana zu Oxford. Der Codex enthält von einer Hand des späten xv. Jh. ein Missale und gehörte laut eines Eintrags (17. Jh.) nach Villach: *Hoc Missale fuit quondam ad usum Eccle. Parochialis S. Martini supra Villacum.* Sein Einband (Holzdeckel mit rotem Lederbezug, einer Schliesse und Spuren von je fünf Metallknöpfen) scheint der Zeit des Missale anzugehören: bei seiner Herstellung wird daher die deutsche in spärlichen Resten vorliegende Perg.-Handschrift, die sich also damals in Kärnten befunden haben wird, und dort, wie wir noch sehen werden, auch geschrieben wurde, zum Schutz des Anfang- und Schlussblattes des Missale zerschnitten worden sein.

Von den erhaltenen 3 Bll. schliessen sich 1 und 2 (resp. 3 und 2), die jetzt durch einen modernen Falz verbunden sind, aneinander; sie dürften, da ja mit Bl. 1^{r} die *Practica* beginnt, die beiden ersten Bll. des Codex gewesen sein; zwischen Bl. 2 und 3 klafft eine Textlücke, deren Umfang nicht sicher einzuschätzen ist, da die Anordnung der Abschnitte in der sonstigen Überlieferung des Traktats schwankend ist. Die Schrift der Bll. ist die fränkische Minuskel, doch beginnen die Rundungen, besonders bei *i, u, m, n,* auch beim *b*-Bogen den spitzigeren, eckigern Formen der gotischen Minuskel zu zustreben und der ganze Schriftduktus zeigt meist einen etwas gedrängten Charakter. Abgesehen von ein oder zwei Fällen verwendet der Schreiber nur das runde (unciale) ȣ, in dessen Langstrich öfters das *e* hineingeschrieben ist (ȣ̈), besonders bei *unde.* Sonst ist von Ligaturen nur die bekannte des *st* gebraucht.

Charakteristisch ist die *z*-Form; sein Schaft reicht stets über die Zeile hinauf, meist zur Höhe des *h*, *l* und Ansatz und Schlussstrich zeigen die mannigfaltigsten Variationen im einzelnen; daneben tritt ziemlich häufig die *h*-ähnliche (bair. alem.) Form des Buchstaben, öfters wieder in eigentümlicher Gestaltung, indem es scheint, dass an einen *n*(*η*)-ähnlichen Körper erst die Oberlänge angesetzt wurde. Die Oberlängen des *h*, *l*, *b* haben neben einfacher Abschrägung meist kleine Ansätze oder Spaltung und öfters Einsatz von links. Das *i* zeigt weder Strich noch Punkt, auch nicht in der Verbindung mit *n*, *m*, *u*. Wenn wir die Hand rund um 1200 ansetzen, werden wir nicht viel fehl gehen. Die Schrift ist gut erhalten, doch erschwert ein Überzug aus dünnem Ölpapier das Lesen von Bl. 1^{r} und teilweise (linke obere Ecke) von Bl. 3^{v}, sowie in der Mitte von Bl. 2; ausserdem haben Löcher im Pergament zu Buchstabenverlusten geführt. Beides erklärt die Textergänzungen des Abdrucks in eckigen Klammern. Der äussere, sowie der obere und untere Rand der Blätter sind beschnitten, ihre Maase sind jetzt: Bl. 1: 20, 8 × 15, 2 cm.; Bl. 2: 21 × 14, 9 cm.; Bl. 3: 21, 2 × 15, 3 cm. An Schmuck findet sich nur ein zwei Zeilen hoher roter Initialbuchstabe D zu Beginn des Traktates sowie zahlreiche rote Absatzzeichen; ausserdem sind die Kapitalen am Satzanfange und sonst meist rot durchstrichen.

2. Die Sprache des Schreibers weist zweifelsohne auf bair.-österreichisches Gebiet, wodurch die oben ausgesprochene Vermutung die Herkunft des Bruchstücks betreffend, an Warscheinlichkeit gewinnt.

Ich führe die wichtigsten Erscheinungen an:

A. Konsonantismus. 1. Labiale. Die Anlautsverschiebung *p* > *pf* ist nur durch das Lehnwort *pflaster* 3^{v}, 23 belegt. Verschiebung der Geminata *pp* > *ph* (*pf*) zeigt *tapher* 1^{v}, 27. Rom. *p*- als *b*- in *bractica* 1^{r}, 3 (doch *pr*- 1^{r}, 8). Germ. *b*- > *p*- in Anlaut nur bei *pallellin* 3^{v}, 13, wenn dies zu *bal* gehört und nicht für *pillellin* verschrieben ist. Im Inlaut ist germ. -*b*- stets durch *b* wiedergegeben, im Auslaut erscheint neben regelmässigen -*b*, *wib* 3^{r}, 4, 8, 13, etc. vor Vokal und Konsonant einmal *chomp* 3^{r}, 5 (vor *s*-). Germ. *f* wird im Anlaut ohne Regel bezeichnet durch *f*-, *v*-, *u*-, einmal, *ůůhte* 1^{v}, 8, durch *ů*, um es von dem folgenden *v* als Konsonant abzuheben; im Inlaut steht stets -*u*- in *auir* 2^{r}, 28. 2^{v}, 2, etc. und in *heuet* 3^{v}, 28, dagegen *b* in *swebil* 3^{r}, 15.

2. Dentale. Germ. *t*. Die Affricata wird im Anlaut durch *z* bezeichnet, daneben (wie im Lateinischen) *c*: *ceware* 2^{r}, 14, *celle* 2^{r}, 9;

im Inlaut durch *zz*: *hizze* 1r, 22, aber *híze* 2v, 6, öfters *c*: *lucil* 1v, 8. 2v, 26, besonders nach *l* und *r*: *hulcinem* 3v, 22, *pulcel* 3r, 20, *churcer* 3r, 23; also stets vor den Frontvokalen (*i*, *e*), vgl. Schatz, *Altbair. Gr.*, § 57. Die Doppelspirans steht sowol nach kurzem wie langem Vokal *wazzer* 1r, 21, *wizzez* 1v, 19, etc., doch *heizet* 2r, 24, *beizen* 3r, 13, 15.—Unorganisches *-t* in *degentkint* 3v, 5.—Germ. *d* > *t* verschoben: *tach* 2v, 25, *tapher* 1v, 27, *tútir* 3v, 11, etc., im Lehnwort *getihtit* 1r, 4.—Germ. *þ* > *d*: *dicke* 2r, 7, *degentkint* 3v, 5, *bedutet* 1v, 5, 7. 2v, 4, 10, 13, aber *tivtit* 1r, 9 und *tivschen* 1r, 3.

3. Gutturale. Germ. *k* im Anlaut als *ch-*, daneben nur 5 *k-* und 2 *c-* (in *craiz* 2r, 5, 18), ebenso *-ch* hinter *r*, *l*: *merchen* 1v, 2, *starche* 1v, 10, *wulchelin* 2v, 28, *chalch* 3v, 20.—Für die Geminata findet sich (1) *chk*: *dichke* 2r, 7, 20, 26. 2v, 21, 3v, 17, *nachke* 2r, 8, *ruchke* 3v, 19. (2) *ch*: *diche* 1v, 1, 11, 26, *truchene* 1r, 27, *steche* 3v, 18. (3) *ck*: *dicke* 1v, 4. 2v, 19. (4) *k*: *trukene* 1r, 24, *gehekit* 3r, 5. Die Spirans wird durch *ch* bezeichnet, selten durch *h*: *kriehischen* 1r, 12, 15, *welhen* 1r, 18, *sihtûmes* 3v, 19, doch stets vor *t*: *uersûhte* 1r, 11, etc. Germ. *h*: vor *t*: *rehtin* 1r, 13, *lieht* 2v, 18, etc. Im Auslaut als *-ch*: *merratich* 3v, 25. Eingeschoben ohne Lautwert in *gescahft* 3v, 2.

Die Lautverbindung *sk* erscheint als (1) *sk*: *mennisk* 2v, 8. (2) *sc*: *gescriben* 1r, 15, etc. (3) *sch*: *schol* 1r, 6, *kriechischen* 1r, 12, 14, *schevmich* 2r, 18, *mennsch* 1r, 19 u. ö. (4) *s*: *mennise* 2v, 5, *suln* 1r, 14, *sol* 3r, 28. —Germ. *g* im Anlaut u. Inlaut stets durch *g* bezeichnet (vgl. oben zu *b*), im Auslaut durchaus *-ch*: *dinch* 1r, 11, 27. 1v, 1, *wech* 1r, 13, *griezzech* 2v, 27, *schevmich* 2r, 18, *lanchrache* 1v, 13 (16), *tach* 2v, 25, *honich saime* 3v, 26, womit die Affricata gemeint sein wird.

4. Sonorlaute: *n* erscheint dreimal im Auslaut durch *-m* wiedergegeben: (*dem*) *menschem* 2v, 7, *allimsamt* 3v, 23, *habim* 3r, 14, *umnazigen* 2r, 23, in allen Fällen gehen *m* oder *b* voraus oder folgen, Weinhold, *Bair. Gr.* § 139, Kraus, *Deutsche Gedichte des XII. Jahrhunderts* zu IV, 2. —*m* ist abgefallen in *siechtû* 3v, 16.

w, das bereits durchaus so bezeichnet wird und auch für die Lautverbindung *wu* dient (*geswlst* 3v, 14), ist ausgefallen in *senne* 2r, 13 (doch *swenne* 2r, 28) und *zai* 3r, 21 (dagegen *zewei* 3v, 12, *zeiwi* 3v, 6); will man darin nicht blosse Schreibfehler sehen, so könnte man an geringe Intensität des Lautes denken; *Bair. Gr.* § 135; *kw* natürlich > *ch-* in *chumt* 1r, 25, etc.

B. Vokalismus. 1. Stammsilben.

a: Übergang zu *o* vor *m* in *chomp* 3r, 5. Beschränkt wird *a* weiter durch den Umlaut > *e*: *enger* 1v, 20, *unchreftich* 2r, 19, *ezzich* 3r, 14, 15,

gensinem 3r, 7, *gen(s)smer* 3r, 20, etc.; vor *r* + Kons.: *merchen* 1r, 2, *werme* (vb.) 3v, 5 und *wirm* (subst.) 1r, 22 [s. jüng. Physiol. *Fdgr.* I. 35, 30, *WSB* 42, 127, 26 (die Tegernseer Überlieferung des Bartholomaeus), *Bair. Gr.* § 18, *Beiträge*, 28, S. 61 u. 67], *swerze* 2v, 10; vor *l* + Kons. *cheltin* 1r, 24; über eine Mittelsilbe hin in *erzenie* 3v, 26, doch bleibt *a* in *tageliche* 2r, 27. 2v, 3, *magede* 3r, 10, *pallellin* 3v, 13 [doch s. oben A, 1].

a > *e* geschwächt in *denne* 1v, 24. 2v, 12. 3r, 24.

ë: durch *æ* bezeichnet in *dær* 2r, 12, *Bair. Gr.* § 10, doch s. Anm. zur Stelle.

u: Graphische Bezeichnung *u, v* (z. b. *chvnst* 1r, 13) einmal *w*: *wnde* 3v, 7 (vgl. *werwde* 3v, 27); steht in *tútirei* 3v, 11 (Graff, *ahd. Sprachschatz* 5, 384), neben *chu-* < *qui* auch *cho-*: *chomit* 2r, 6, 27. 3r, 9, 12. Der Umlaut des *u* findet keine Bezeichnung, vgl. *dunne* 1r, 28, *hulcinem* 3v, 22, *gehugede* 2r, 9, *wulchelin* 2v, 28, *múl* 3r, 21, etc.

ā: in *ware* 1r, 12, *bla* 2r, 2, etc.; der Umlaut durchaus unbezeichnet: *gahis* 1v, 9, *lanchrache* 1v, 13, *kasluppe* 3v, 21, *merratich* 3v, 25, *mazlichen* 3v, 26, *ummazigem* 2r, 23.

ī: aus *ige* in *lît* 2r, 4, 9, 10. 2v, 28. Von Diphthongierung zeigt sich noch keine Spur. Vgl. Lessiak, *Vokalismus in Kärnt. Urkunden, Prager Deutsche Studien* 8, S. 252. Aus der Gurker Kanzlei, die sich sehr conservativ hält, das erste Beispiel vom J. 1208.—Vgl. auch Dollmayr, *Sprache der Wiener Genesis*, S. 4.

ō: Umlaut nicht bezeichnet: *grozir* 2r, 2.

ū: als *u* in *buche* 3v, 17, *luter* 1v, 19, 27. 2v, 4, 6, 18, *grúzeloht* 2r, 13; seinen Übergang zu *ou* zeigt *lůter* 2r, 2, wie den seines Umlautes *ū̆* > *eu*: *schevmich* 2r, 18, aber anderseits *vúhte* 1r, 23. 1v, 8, 10. S. Lessiak, S. 256 f., 258. Die sicheren Belege aus dem 12. Jh. sind weit zahlreicher als für *î* > *ei*; die Zeichen *ů* resp. *ev* stehen erst vom Beginn des 13. Jh. ab, was zu der obigen Datierung der Fragmente aus palæographischen Gründen stimmt.—Dollmayr, S. 4, verzeichnet nur je ein *û, ou*, zwei *iu* (= *û*), kein *eu*.

ei = germ. *ai*; in 12 Fällen durch *ai* bezeichnet gegenüber 14 *ei*; beide Bezeichnungen z. T. in demselben Wörtern z. b. *craiz* 2r, 5: *chreiz* 1v, 26, *meister* 1r, 1: *maister* 1r, 5, *haizzet* 2r, 22: *heizet* 2r, 24. Lessiak, S. 269 f., der das Schwanken zwischen *ei* und *ai* bes. in der Gurker Kanzlei hervorhebt. Dollmayr, S. 4.—Durch *e* (vor *n*) bezeichnet nur in *enim* 3v, 6.

ie < mlat. *ē*: *brief* 1r, 6, *viebir* 2r, 22 u. ö.

< ahd. *io*, aobd. *iu*: *siech, siechtům*, daneben *i*: *sichtům* 2r, 2, *sich* 2v, 5, *î*: *sîch* 2r, 8, 19. *scïebe* (imp.) 3v, 7, dagegen natürlich *iu* (*iv*) in

Fällen wie *tivschen* 1r, 3, *tivtit* 1r, 9, *nivz* 3r, 3; ferner *div* 3r, 6, *elliv* 1r, 11, *sumelichiv* 3v, 15, neben *-ev* 3r, 4, 8. Lessiak, S. 268, Dollmayr, S. 4 f. *u*: *bedutet* 1v, 5, 7. 2v, 4, 10.—In *viwer* 1r, 21, *fivwer* 3v, 6 zeigt sich bereits Zerdehnung der Silbe. Lessiak, S. 268 (auch 257), *Bair. Gr.* § 94.

ou: bezeichnet durch *ǒ tǒgen* 3v, 10, *ǒgen* 3v, 3, *hǒbit* 1v, 17; durch *ov*: *ovch* 1v, 20; durch *o*: *hobit* 1v, 16. 2r, 5, 8, 11 u. ö.; durch *ô*: *hôbit* 1v, 27. 2r, 1. Sein Umlaut ist durch *eu* bezeichnet in: *inuerdeutes* 2v, 9, Lessiak, S. 267. *ouw* als *ow*: *scowen* 1r, 18. 1v, 24.

uo: dafür findet sich (1) *û*: *bûch* 1r, 1, 3, 5 u. ö. (2) *v̂*: *versv̂hte* 1r, 11, *gemv̂tis* 1v, 9, *gv̂tim* 3r, 2 u. ö. (3) *v*: *zv* 1r, 5 (aber *zv̂* 3r, 11). Der Umlaut ist nicht bezeichnet: *trûbe* 2v, 15, *gebûzit* 2r, 17. Lessiak, S. 271. Hervorzuheben ist, dass die Bezeichnung durch *ǒ* fehlt.

2. Vokale der Mittelsilben: Von schweren Mittelsilben ist erhalten: *-isc* in *mennisk* 2v, 8, *-isch* 1v, 7, etc., *-ise* 2v, 5 (dagegen *mensch* 1r, 19, 22. 1v, 2, etc.), *chriehiscen* 1r, 15; *-oht* in *gruzeloht* 2r, 14; *-ling* in *chisilingen* 3v, 20; *-în* in *gensinem* 3r, 7. Dagegen *-œre* > *-er*: *meister* 1r, 1, 5.

Von leichten Mittelsilben erscheint *-an* in *galgan* 3v, 9; *at* > *et* in *magede* 3r, 10; *-it* zwar stets als *-it* in *hǒbit(e)*, aber bei der ausserordentlich starken Neigung des Denkmals *ə* durch *i* wiederzugeben, wird auch dies hieher zurechnen sein; vgl. *lutir, viebir, winstir, tuttirei, adir, chaltir*; *obin, morgin, allint halbin, gebratiniz, habim*; *lungil* u.s.w., selbst *iemin* 1r, 17 < *-men* < *man*.

Sprossenvokal kommt vor zwischen *s* und *w*: *zesuweme* 2r, 3, *zesewen* 2v, 16; zwischen *z* und *w*: *zewei* 3v, 12, Schatz, *Altbair. Gr.* § 54, Dollmayr § 26; so wird auch das *w* = *u* in *werwde* 3v, 27 aufzufassen sein; ferner *witewen* 3r, 10.

C. Ableitung. Ausser den schon erwähnten *-oht* und dem Demin. Suffix *-elin* in *pallellin* 3v, 13 wäre noch hervorzuheben das *-il* Suffix in *lungeln* 2v, 5, 7 und *pulcel* 3r, 20.

D. Composition. Erwähnt seien *rosole* 3v, 4 (*Ahd. Gl.* III. 507, 45 und Gröger, § 22) neben *roseole* 3v, 9; *gensmer* l. *genssmer* (s. *Ahd. Gl.* III. 617, 12 *genschorn*); *glasevaz* 1v, 19, 23; *schínbein* 3r, 16; *rorhonige* 3v, 13.

E. Flexion. Substantiva. Sie stehen bereits ganz auf mhd. Stufe. Die Casussilben zeigen überwiegend *i* für *ə*, Apokope, bes. hinter *l, r, n*, und Synkope machen sich ziemlich geltend. Apokope beim *Masc.*: Stets, vor Vokal oder Konsonant, *der mennsch* 1r, 19. 1v, 2, etc., nur 2v, 5 *mennise*; 2v, 23 steht der acc. *den mennisch* aber dem Schreiber schwebte da wol der nom. (als Subjekt zu *durstit*) oder

das neutr. vor, das kurz darauf 2^{v}, 26 steht. Ferner vor Vokal: *arzat* 1^{r}, 15 (n. pl.), *mirtilbŏm* 3^{v}, 12 (dat. sgl.).—*Neut.*: vor Vokal *gens(s)mer* 3^{r}, 20 (acc. sgl.), vor Kons. die Dat.: *bůch* 1^{r}, 5, *wazzer* 1^{r}, 21, 23. 1^{v}, 9, *viwer* 1^{r}, 21, 23, *hŏbit* 1^{v}, 17. 2^{r}, 11, doch anderseits: *smerwe* 3^{r}, 7, *bůche* 1^{r}, 11, *lufte* 1^{r}, 21, 24, *hôbite* 2^{r}, 1, *honige* 3^{r}, 2, *vaze* 3^{v}, 22.—*Fem.*: vor Vokal: *adir* 3^{v}, 1 (n. pl.), *wirm* 1^{r}, 22 (n. sgl.); vor Kons.: *fúht* 1^{v}, 10 (n. sgl.), die Dat. *chaltin* 1^{r}, 26, *stet* 2^{r}, 4, *natur* 2^{r}, 3 (gen. 2^{r}, 7, 9, 28); *lungil* 2^{v}, 7, 10; anderseits *fúhte* 1^{r}, 23. 1^{v}, 8, *truchene* 1^{r}, 24, 27.

Synkope: *blatirn* 2^{v}, 27, *lungeln* 2^{v}, 5.

Sonst seien noch angeführt: *man* 3^{r}, 26 (acc. plur.), *manne* 3^{r}, 9 (gen. pl.), *mannin* 3^{v}, 4 (dat. pl.).—*naht* 1^{v}, 23 (dat. sgl.), aber *des nahtis* 1^{v}, 22.

Adjectiv: Dat. auf *-eme* nur *zesuweme* 2^{r}, 3, sonst *-em*: *hulcinem* 3^{r}, 22; *gůtim* 3^{r}, 2, etc. Gen. Fem. *chaltir* 2^{r}, 28. Nom. plur. neut. *sumelichev* 3^{r}, 4, 8; aber in prädicativ. Gebrauch *ware* 1^{r}, 12, *sêre* 3^{r}, 8 (Paul, *mhd. Gr.* § 227, 1 Anm.).

Pronomina: Dat. sgl. *ime* 2^{v}, 9 (betont) sonst *im*; nom. und acc. neutr. pl. *si* 3^{r}, 9; 1^{r}, 12. 3^{r}, 5, 25, 27, *sie* 3^{v}, 15.

Artikel: Gen. sgl. fem. durchaus *der*; dat. m. n. *deme* 2^{r}, 2, sonst *dem*; Instr. *uon div* 2^{r}, 23; n. acc. neutr. pl. *div* 3^{v}, 6, *dei* 3^{r}, 16, 21, 24. 3^{v}, 12, *deiv* 2^{v}, 28, *die* 1^{r}, 11. 3^{r}, 13.—Relativ: *daz da* 2^{r}, 24, *div da* 2^{r}, 4.

Verbum: Apokope in *múl* (imp.) 3^{r}, 21. 3^{v}, 22 vor Kons., 3^{v}, 8 vor Vokal; *temper* (conj. und imp.) 3^{r}, 6. 3^{v}, 9, 12 vor Kons., *mach* 3^{v}, 22 vor Vokal, dagegen *mache* 3^{v}, 13 vor Kons.—Synkope: hinter r: *gelert* 1^{r}, 11, 13, *ersworn* 2^{v}, 7, aber *temperen* 3^{r}, 2; hinter l: *entswilt* 3^{r}, 22, aber *geswillet* 3^{r}, 26. 3^{v}, 2, *suln* 1^{r}, 14. 1^{v}, 17, doch dreimal *schulin*; hinter m: *chumt* 1^{r}, 25, 26, aber 10 mal *chumit, benimit* 3^{r}, 18, durchaus *wirt*. Dagegen die unsynkopierten Formen hinter nn: *gewinnet, erbrinnit, beginnit*, hinter g: *lediget, gisagit* und anderen Kons. oder Verbindungen z. b. *gesezet* 1^{r}, 5, *irswarzet* 1^{v}, 15, *bedutet* 1^{v}, 5, *heuet* 3^{v}, 28 u. a.

Einzelne Formen: *gevahen* 1^{v}, 21, *stan* 1^{v}, 11, *gat* 1^{v}, 25. 3^{v}, 27 neben *get* 2^{r}, 12; neben *sol* 3^{r}, 28 steht *scol* (5), *schol* (2); neben *suln* (1), *schul(i)n* (2), *sculen* (1); *scolt* (1).—*wellest* (2. p. conj.) 3^{v}, 24.—3. p. pl. ind. *zebresten sie* 3^{v}, 15 sonst stets *-t*; endlich die Imperative *bewille* 3^{v}, 7, *sc̈iebe* 3^{v}, 7, *ribe* 3^{v}, 25, Dollmayr § 68. 1, Weinhold, *mhd. Gr.* § 371.

Adverbia: *alrest* 1^{r}, 17, *allerst* 2^{v}, 21; erwähnenswert *obinende* 2^{r}, 13.

Praepositionen: *an* (= *āne*) 3^{r}, 25; neben *in* zwei *en* 1^{r}, 3. 3^{r}, 23.

F. Akzente. Der Schreiber verwendet sowol den Akut (´) als auch den Dachakzent (^); dieser steht nur auf langen Vokalen, sollte also jedesfalls als Quantitätszeichen dienen: *grâ* 1v, 16, *lît* 2r, 4 (3 mal *lit*), *gebûzit* 2r, 17, *sêre* 3r, 8, *wê* 3v, 17, ebenso *vîebir* 2r, 21 (neben *viebir*); jener auf Kürzen und Längen: *lúfte* 1r, 21, *mítter naht* 1v, 23, *híze* 2v, 6, *múl* 3r, 21, *tútirei* 3v, 11, *ávir* 2r, 28, *síten* 2v, 16, *vúhte* 1r, 23. 1v, 8, 10, *lútir* 1v, 19. 2v, 18, *é* 1v, 21, *grúzeloht* 2r, 13, *schínbein* 3r, 16; auf dem lat. Wort *melancolía* 2r, 6, und auf der Endsilbe in *stactén* 3r, 6; endlich steht ein Doppelakut in *sc̈iebe* 3v, 7.—Die Setzung der Akzente entspricht also im ganzen Typus II bei P. Sievers, *Die Accente in ahd. und as. Handschriften* (*Palæstra*, LVII.).

3. Wir haben Einleitung und Teile des Kapitels vom Harn sowie der gynäkologischen Stücke aus der sogenannten Practica des Magister Bartholomaeus von Salerno vor uns, deren ndd. Text nach einer Gothaer Hs. F. von Oefele, Neuenahr, 1894, herausgegeben hat, nachdem Pfeiffer schon 1863 die Tegernsee-Münchener Hs. des 13. Jhs. in den *Wiener Sitzg. Berichten*, Bd. 42, S. 127 ff., abgedruckt und J. Haupt ebd. Bd. 71, S. 451 ff. unter scharfer Kritik dieser Arbeit eine Anzahl anderer, meist besserer und vollständigerer Hss. des Traktats besprochen hatte. Seither ist das Material noch beträchtlich angewachsen: vgl. C. Borchling, *Mittelniederdeutsche Handschriften*, II. (1900), S. 50 f. und R. Priebsch, *Deutsche Hss. in England*, II. (1901), SS. 41, 159, 167, 268. Oefeles Veröffentlichung ist mir leider hier unzugänglich. Jedesfalls hat der deutsche Traktat wenig oder nichts mit der *Practica* des Magister Bartholomaeus Salernitanus, eines Schülers des Constantinus Africanus, zu tun, die S. de Renzi im 4. Bd. S. 321–408 der *Collectio Salernitana*, 1852, veröffentlicht hat[1]; er bezeichnet sich zudem ja selbst als Übersetzung der *Introductiones et experimenta magistri Bartholomei in practicam Ypocratis, Galieni, Constantini*, einer Arbeit also, die wol den magister B. zum Verfasser haben kann, aber verloren scheint.

Das Interesse unserer Bruchstücke beruht auf ihrem Alter und ihrer Heimat: wir wissen jetzt, dass die Übertragung dieses umfangreichen medicinischen Traktats sicher ins 12. Jh. zurückreicht. Ob sie von Haus aus die Arbeit eines mitteldeutschen Geistlichen war, wie

[1] Der Traktat findet sich auch in zwei Hss. des 13. Jh. im Brit. Museum: Royal 12 E VIII fol. 28v und 126r und Royal 12 B XII fol. 5r.—Als Autorität wird Bartholomaeus in Royal 12 D XIII (14. Jh.) angezogen in einer Receptenreihe *de urina*: Bl. 219v *Ad fistulā. a magrō bartholomeo ꝺbatū. ℞ pipermellā*, etc.—Sudhof der allerdings an die Abhängigkeit der Übersetzung von jenem Traktate glaubt, meint (*Zs. f. d. Philologie*, 46, 129) doch, dass der Zusammenhang dieser Salernitaner Schulschrift mit dem deutschen Bartholomaeus eine ganz besonders eingehende Untersuchung erfordert.

Haupt a. a. O., S. 520 annimmt, wird aus unserer Überlieferung nicht deutlich. Höchstens könnte das Fehlen der bair.-österr. *p* und *k* im An- und Inlaut für germ. *b*, *g*, also der Laute, deren graphische Bezeichnung zu dieser Zeit auf diesem Gebiet so schwankend ist, darauf deuten, und aus der Flexion das gelegentliche Auftreten von *die* st. *diu* sowie die Formen *ware* und *sêre* (s. unter Adjectiva), wenn sie nicht vielmehr als Adverbialendungen zu fassen sind (Grimm, *Gr.*, IV. 924). Ein md. Original könnte, wie das ja von mehreren Gedichtvorlagen feststeht, mit der Klosterbesiedlung aus dem Westen im 12. Jh. leicht ins südöstliche Gebiet gelangt, allein auch die Arbeit eines Mönchs md. Abkunft in einem der Klöster Kärntens gewesen sein. Welch grosser Beliebtheit die Übersetzung sich erfreute, beweist dann ihre erstaunliche Ausbreitung über Ober-, Mittel- und Niederdeutschland in Abschriften des 13–15. Jh.

Um die Stellung unserer Fragmente zu bestimmen, bedürfte es einer Durcharbeitung des weit zerstreuten hsl. Materials. Nur so viel sei gesagt, dass auch sie die Minderwertigkeit der bis dahin ältesten Tegernseer Abschrift bestätigen, sowol im Kapitel vom Harn als auch in den gynäkologischen Abschnitten, die, soweit erhalten, ihrer Reihenfolge nach mit der in den Wiener Hss. 2531 und 3217 (s. Haupt a. a. O., S. 476 und 482) und der Add. Hs. 16,892 (XIV. Jh. thüringisch) des Britischen Museums beobachteten Ordnung übereinstimmen; allein es ist zu bemerken, dass der Abschnitt 3^{r}, 17–24, den weder T noch Wien 2531 noch Add. 16,892 bringen, wol aus einem andern Kapitel (vom Harn?) hier (und in Wien 3217) hereingekommen sein mag, und dass ferner das Parallelrecept 3^{v}, 10–14 ausser T auch der Wiener Hs. 2524 (Haupt a. a. O., S. 469) und der Add. Hs., die ich noch zur Kontrolle herbeiziehen konnte, fehlt.

Von der Art des Abdrucks gilt das zu I (*Mod. Lang. Review*, X. 2, S. 216) den *Fragmenten des sog. Züricher Arzneibuches* Bemerkte. Für eine Nachvergleichung einzelner Stellen mit der Handschrift bin ich Dr L. Willoughby verpflichtet; endlich schulde ich der Verwaltung der Bodleiana Dank für die Erlaubnis, die Bruchstücke veröffentlichen zu dürfen.

1r D[itze] buch daz ti[hte ein] meiſter der [hie]z bar tholomeuſ. daz [nam er] ze kriechen uz einem bůche. daz haizit br[actica. da]z iſt hie en tivſchen getihtit. mit den ſelbe[n wort]en alſ iz bartholome uſ der maiſter zv der la[tine h]at geſezet an ſinem bůch ¶ Swer den brief diſſeſ bů[cheſ] wil wizzen. der ſchol in alſo erkennin. int[roductio]neſ 7 expim̄ta magiſ tri bartholomei in practicam Ypocratiſ. Galieni. Con ſtantini greco24 medico24. ¶ Der brief der tivtit alſuſ. bartholomeuſ der maiſter. daz er unſ an diſem bůche gelert hat. elliv dinch die er uer ſv̊hte daz ſi ware ſint. in den kriehiſchen bůchen. unde daz er unſ den wech der rehtin chvnſt gelert hat. die wir uindin ſuln in chriechiſch' bů̊chen die da geſcriben [habent die] chriehiſcen arzat Ypocras. Galien' [unde Consta]ntin'.

¶ Swer in den arzat bv̊chen iemin rehte gelerñ wil. der ſcol alreſt wizzen. vz welhen dingen der menſch geſchaffen ſi. Ein ieſlich menniſch der iſt geſchaffen uz vier elementiſ von der erde. uon dem lúfte. von dem wazzer. von dem viwer. Die wirm unde die hizze. hat der menſch uon dem viwer. von d[em wa]zzer die vúhte. von dem lufte die cheltin. von der erde die trukene. ¶ Div rote varwe chumt einim iegelichim uon der hizze. ¶ Div wize varwe chumt uon der keltin. ¶ von der truchene wirt ein iegelich dinch ſmal oder dunne. ¶ von der vuhte wirt ein iegelich

1v dinch [di]che. ¶ Swer n[u wizz]en wil. w[elhen] ſiech tům der mench hab[e der so]l daz merchen bi der varwe. die daz harn [hat daz] von dem menniſchen chvmit. ¶ Swenne d[az harn] iſt rot. unδ dicke. daz bedutet. daz daz blů[t rehte] chraft. unδ gv̊tin gewalt in dem libe hat. ¶ Sw[enne] daz harn iſt dunne uñ

4 *alſ—5 bůch*] T (=Tegernseer Cod. a. a. O. S. 127) *also ez Bartholomeus an sin buoch hat geschriben.* 13 *er—chunſt*] T *er den wech unt die rehten chunst.* 17 *iemin*] T *iht*, L (=Add. 16,892) bl. 5r *imbsicht.* 18 *dingen* T *dingen oder wie.* 20 *von*] T *uz.* 25 *iegelichim*] TL *i. dinge.*

1v. 1 *welhen fiechtům*] T *von wiu ein igelich sichtuom chom den.*

rot. daz bedutit da[z der m]enniſch iſt coleric'. der hat deſ blůtiſ ze v[il vñ]der ůvhte ze lucil von dem wazzer. der mv̊z dur[ch] no[t] gahiſ gemv̊tiſ ſin. wande im diu galle ſchiere erbrinnit. ſo ſtarche. daz ir div fúht niht widir ſtan mach. ¶ So daz harn iſt wiz uñ diche. ſo iſt der menniſch flegmaticuſ. der hat blůtiſ vaimiſ ze vil. geuangin. der iſt lanchrache. uñ ſwiget gerne. ¶ Iſt daz harn dunne vñ wiz. ſo iſt der menniſch melan colic'. der hat deſ blůt[eſ ſo vil] daz iz iſt irſwarzet. der wirt ſere grâ. ¶ So lanch ſo daz hobit iſt ein ani genge deſ menniſchin. ſo ſchuln wir andem hǒbit be ginnen. Swer daz harn rehte ſcowen wil. der ſcol gewinnen ein wizzez glaſe vaz. daz vil lútir ſi. uñ daz obin ettewaz enger ſi denne niden. Erne ſcol ovch daz harn niemer gevahen. é der menniſch wol deſ nahtiſ geſlafe. wan daz harn gewinnet niemmer rehte varwe. unze [nach] mítter naht. Daz glaſe vaz. ſcol man denne de[cken uñ] ſcol iz denne ſcowen. ſo diu ſunne uf gat odir umbe mitten morgin. ¶ Iſt. daz daz harn einen dichen chreiz allumbe hat. ſo iſt daz hôbit tapher ſie[ch]. ¶ Iſt daz harn luter. uñ iſt der chreiz rot. ſo iſt d[eſ blůt]iſ ze vil vorne in

2ʳ de[m] hôbite. ¶ Iſt daz hôbit ſiech in dem hirne. ſo iſt [daz] harn bla uñ lǒter. uñ iſt doch der ſichtv̊m grozir indeme zeſuweme teile deſ hobitiſ. daz chumit uon der natur div da heizzet colera rubea. div ander ſtet lît. Iſt daz harn dunne. uñ iſt der umbe craiz wiz. ſo iſt daz hobit winſtirhalbe ſiech. daz chomit uon der melancolía. der natur. Iſt daz harn wiz uñ dichke. ſo iſt daz hobit ſîch in dem nachke. daz chumit uon deme fleg mate der natur. div lit uon der celle. da div gehugede inne lît. ¶ Swer nu wizzen wil welhen ſiechtům der

1ᵛ. 16 *fere*] TL *schiere*. 17 *wir an*] TL *wir des buoches an*. 19. 23 *glaſe vaz*] T *glas*. 20 *ettewaz* fehlt TL. 25 *Iſt—harn*] T *Hat daz harn*. 26 *allumbe*] TL *alumbe in dem glase* (L *glauaſze*!). 27 *tapher ſiech*] T *tapher unde swære siech*. L *dāphic fich*, also ist *tapher* (adv.) dem Original zuzuschreiben gegen Haupt WSB 71, 453.

2ʳ. 2 *grozir*] T *groze*. 3 *uon*—4 *colera*] TL *von der colerica* (L *colera*). 5 *umbe* fehlt TL. 6 *daz*—8 *in dem* fehlt T zufolge Abirrens des Auges von dem einen *fiech* (6) auf das zweite (8). 8 *uon deme*—9 *div lit uon*] TL *von dem flecmate* (L *fleumate*) *daz lit in*.

menniſch indem hobit habe. der ſchol daz merchen bi dem chreize. dær umbe daz harn get. alſ daz bůch uor geſagit hat. ¶ Senne daz harn iſt obinende grú zeloht. ceware ſo iſt daz hobit ſich allint halbin. Iſt daz harn trůbe uñ [val als deſ v]iheſ. ſo iſt daz hobit ſiech. daz iſt gewiſ daz der [menniſc]h in groze not chumit. imne werde ſin gebûzit. hat daz harn einen grozin craiz. uñ daz iz allint halben iſt ein lucil ſchevmich. ſo iſt daz hobit sîch. uñ iſt diu bruſt vil unchreftich. ¶ Iſt daz harn rot unde dichke. ſo hat der menniſch daz vîebir. daz iſt ſo getan. daz da uon chumit ein ſiechtv̊m der haizzet ſỳnocha ſebriſ. Daz vieber daz chumit uon dem ummazigem blůte. uon div ſcol man daz selbe viebir daz da heizet tercian. daz viebir leidit den menniſchen iemmer andem dritten tage.

der

Iſt daz harn wiz uñ dichke. ſo hat, menniſch daz tageliche viebir. daz ſelbe viebir daz chomit von dem flegmate. daz iſt chaltir natur. ¶ Swenne áuir

2ᵛ [deſ h]arniſ ſo vil iſt. vñ vil dunne. ſo wil daz vieb[ir] ende habin. Beginnit auir daz harn ſwarzen. ſo wil ſich daz tageliche viebir uer wandilin. in t̄cianam. ¶ So daz harn rot uñ luter iſt. uñ ſo ſin vil wirt. daz bedutet daz menniſe ſich iſt ander lungeln. uon der grozen hize. iſt deſ harniſ vil. uñ iſt iz wiz uñ luter. ſo iſt dem menſchem div lungil erſworn. ¶ Iſt daz harn dunne. uñ vil bleich. ſo hat der menniſk ettewaz in uerdeuteſ in ime. ¶ Iſt daz harn rot uñ einteil gemiſchit mit der ſwerze. daz bedutet daz div lungil zeheiz iſt. ¶ So der menniſch ſiechet. uñ ſo daz harn denne wait var iſt odir wirt. odir wiz. odir daz iz trǒbe iſt. daz bedutet. daz der menniſch den

2ʳ. 12 *dær*] aus *dar* korr. 13 *obinende*] TL *oben*. 15 *daz hobit*—16 *daz der*] T *daz houbet so siech, daz der*. 23 *uon div—viebir*] T *da von chumt daz vieber*, L *die selbe feber heizit*. 24 *daz*] davor am Rande von jüngerer Hand *kieſen*, Infinitiv zu nicht mehr verstandenem *ſcol*. 25 *leidit*] T *leidiget* L *ruret; iemmer* fehlt TL.

2ᵛ. 4 *daz bedutet daz menniſe*] T *so ist der mensch*, ebenso 10. 7 *erfworn*] TL *erfroren*. 9 Vor *Iſt daz harn* fehlt in unserem Text nach Ausweis von TL *Iſt daz harn rot unde dicke unde ist sin vil so ist diu lungel* (L *lebere*) *zebrosten*, was sich durch Abirren des Auges von dem einen *rot* auf das zweite erklärt. 12 *odir wirt* fehlt TL. 13 hinter *trǒbe* hat T *als des vihes*.

ſtechen under der winſteren ſiten wil gewinnin.
Iſt daz harn ro[t unde diche v]n̄ doch trûbe. ſo wil er
den ſtechin ge[winnen in der] zeſewen ſíten. da iſt
der menniſch a[ller wermiſt] vnd iſt daz harn an
unze
dem grunde lieht. un̄ lútir, an die mittelode. und
iſt obir halbe diche un̄ trûbe. ſo iſt der menniſch
ſiech umbe die bruſt. ¶ So der menniſch hat daz vie-
bir tercianā. ſin harn iſt allerſt rot un̄ dichke.
der gewinnit den riten. Wirt daz harn wiz un̄
dunne. un̄ durſtit den menniſch harte. ſo gewin
net er daz viebir. daz in iemmer lediget ubir
einin tach. Iſt daz harn milch var. un̄ iſt ſin
lucil. un̄ dunne. ſo hat daz menniſch den harn
ſtain inder blatirn. Iſt daz harn griezzech
un̄ daz deiv wulchelin ſchinent indem harn. ſo lit

3r [werden ſo] nim die linſe un̄ beizze die mit wine
dar [nach s]oltu die temperen mit gv̊tim honi
l
ge un̄ nivz die erzenie al,e tage. un̄ wirſtu
ſciere geſunt. ¶ Nu ſint ſumilichev wib. daz
ſi der chomp ſwirt. alſo ſi da gehekit sin.
Div neme ſtactén odir timiana. un̄ temper
daz mit genſinem ſmerwe. un̄ ſtriche die
falben dar in. ¶ Sumelichev wib ſint ſêre in der
matrice. daz chomit da uon. daz ſi der manne
niht en habint. alſo die witewen un̄ die mage
er
de. odir ſo der man ſo lange iſt. daz eniht zv̊
dem wibe chomit. da uon wirt vil manich
wib ſiech. die ſchulin ſaluai beizen mit dem
ezzich. en ſculin den habim indem munde.
un̄ ſwebil auer nem[en v]n̄ beizin in ezzich.
un̄ ſculen dei ſchín bein da mit riben. ſo wirt

2v. 14 *under*] TL *in*. 17 *vnd* fehlt TL. 22 *der—riten* fehlt TL. 27 *ſtain*] dahinter ein Buchstabe *n* (?) ausradiert. 28 *wulchelin*] TL *flekelin*.

3r. 2 *gv̊tim* fehlt T (S. 132, 23) L (bl. 24v). 4 *Nu ſint*—3v, 14 *dir baz* fehlt in T; L bringt, obschon mit einzelnen Kürzungen diese Stücke mit Ausnahme von 3r, 17 *Sumeliche*—24 *lihte* und 3v, 10 *Ne helfe*—14 *baz*; s. oben S. 328, und die Anführungen Haupts a. a. O. S. 476 aus der Wiener Hs. 2531 (W). 14 *en*] l. *unde* (=W). 16 *ſchín bein*] L *schenebein*, W *chiwen*.

in baz. ¶ Sumeliche ſint die geſwellent vil grozze. uñ benimit in die chraft. daz ſi deſ harniſ niht habin mugen. uon der geſwlſt. die ſculen nemen pulcel idadragne uñ genſmer. uñ múl dei zai zeſamene. uñ ſalbe dich wol vaſte damit. bi einim ſiwer. ſo entſwilt der menniſch enchurcer friſt. wnd̄ gewin net daz harn denne lihte. ¶ So dei wib arbeit lident. da ſi ze lange an arbeman man ſint. daz in div matrix geſwillet. hilfit man indeſ niht. ſo werdent ſi cole ri[ca]. den ſelben ſichtům ſol man da bi kieſen

3v daz in die adir alli donit under dem a[ntlizze] uñ geſwillit in div geſcahft. innir halbe. [vzzer h]albe iſt ſi fleht. uñ garrent in div ǒgen. alſe die bi den mannin geligent. ſo ſcolt du nemen roſole uñ einiſ wibeſ ſpunne. div ein degentkint ſǒget. uñ wer me div zeiwi bi enim ſivwer. uñ nim eine vil weiche wolle. wnde bewille die da inne. uñ scſebe die denne an die ſtat. ¶ Ne helfe daz niht. ſo mul eine galgan uñ temper die auer mit roſe ole. uñ ſalbe dich da mit ander togen. ¶ Ne helfe dich daz niht. ſo nim ein tútir ei gebratiniz uñ mul daz e mit einim mirtilbǒm. uñ temper dei zewei denne mit ror honige. uñ mache dar uz pallel lin. uñ lege die an die geſwlſt. ſo wirt dir baz. ¶ Sumelichiv wib. ſo ſ[i chi]nt gewinnent. ſo zebreſ ten ſie in der wamb[e. d]en ſiechtů ſculen ſi da mit chieſen. In iſt wê vil dichke indem buche. ſo ſi ſchizent. ſo iſt in alſ ein ſpiz ſteche indem ruchke. Deſ ſihtůmeſ ſcol man alſuſ helfin. Dv ſcolt nemen einin chalch. der uz chiſilingen ſi ge brant. uñ kaſluppe div ungebidirbit ſi. uñ ſeife.

3r. 17 *Sumeliche*] das Subjektsubst. ist aus dem Z. 23 erscheinenden *menniſch* zu nehmen.

3v. 1 *donit*] l. *donint* (Vorlage wol *donīt*). 3 *garrent*] L *zerent*, W1 (=Wiener Hs. 2524 s. Haupt a. a. O. S. 469) *gantirn*. 17 *ſo ſi*—19 *ruchke*] T *unde so si sitzent, so ist in also we, als in ein spiz durch den ruke ge*, L *vñ ist alse si ein spiz steche i den rvcke*. 18 Vor *ſchizent* ist *ſiechent* durchgestrichen.

uñ zemul daz in einem hulcinem uaze. uñ mach uz dem allim ſamt. ein pflaſter. uñ lege daz an die ſtat. ſo wirt dir zeſtebaz. ¶ Welleſt du deſ niht tůn. ſo nim merratich. uñ ribe den mit dem honich ſaime. uñ nivz die erzenie. vil mazlichen alle tage unze dir baz werwde. ¶ Ez ergat ǒch vil ofte daz ſich einiz heuet inder matrice

3v. 24 *zestebaz*] l. mit T *zestete b.* (L *and*^{s} *stat*). 24 *Welleſt*—27 *werwde* fehlt L. 28 *einiz*] ? TW *eizze*, L *swern*.

R. Priebsch.

London.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

The 'Beowulf' Manuscript.

A few years ago, when turning over the *Beowulf* MS., I was surprised to observe that certain facts had escaped notice or attention. And they are worth while setting out, if only as an indication of the dangers that beset a historical study in which insufficient attention is paid to manuscript indications, often the clearest indications of time and place.

The MS. volume Vitellius A. xv consists of two separate codices, fortuitously brought together by the binder in the sixteenth century.

The first, ff. 4*a*–93*b* in the present numbering, comes, like the Bede MS. Otho B. xi, from the priory of St Mary's, Southwick, Hants., as appears from the entry on f. 5*b*: *Hic liber est ecclesie beate marie de Suwika*, etc.[1] It is written in two main hands, the first extending to the end of *Augustine's Soliloquies* (f. 59*b*), the second from the beginning of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* to the end of the codex, which is imperfect. Both hands may be assigned roughly to the middle of the twelfth century[2].

The second codex, ff. 94–209 in the present numbering[3], is imperfect at beginning and end. It also is written in two hands: the first, extending from f. 94*a* to f. 175*b*, is the first hand of *Beowulf*; the second, extending thence to the end of the codex, is the second hand of *Beowulf*. Taken together they are usually dated *circa* 1000, and with good reason.

From this certain results follow. First, we can no longer say, with the most recent editor of *Beowulf*, 'as to the history of the [*Beowulf*] MS. we have no information, till we find it in the collection formed by

[1] Cockayne's suggested emendation to *Euerwika* (*Shrine*, p. 294), followed by W. H. Hulme *Die Sprache der ae. Bearbeitung der Soliloquien Augustins*, p. 1, is unjustifiable.

[2] Hargrove in his edition of *Augustine's Soliloquies*, with a fine disregard of the facsimile he reproduces, states that his text is in the same hand as *Beowulf*.

[3] The numbering of blank dividing leaves advances the former foliation of the second codex by 3.

Sir Robert Cotton[1].' In the natural place, at the top of the first page of the codex (f. 94*a*), is written the name 'Lawrence Nowell' with date 1563; and the credit of preserving *Beowulf* must be given—in part at least—to that indefatigable pioneer in Anglo-Saxon studies[2]. Unfortunately, the inscription does not help much more. As far as I know, very few ancient manuscripts, and none of certain provenance, can be traced to Nowell, and so we cannot tell what libraries he drew upon. He was, of course, Dean of Lichfield at the time, and it may be that he obtained the MS. there or in that neighbourhood. But, failing definite evidence, this must remain a rather remote possibility[3].

Again, the intolerable confusion in the dating of the prose pieces which precede *Beowulf* in the second codex (ff. 94*a*–98*a* *Christophorus* fragment, 98*b*–106*b* *Wonders of the East*, 107*a*–131*b* *Letter of Alexander*) comes to an end. The hand of these pieces, which is the first hand of *Beowulf*, is referred to various dates in the eleventh and even the twelfth century[4]. We thus have on the one side complete agreement that the date of the hand in *Beowulf* is '*circa* 1000,' or 'late tenth century,' and on the other the widest discrepancy in the dating of the identical script[5] when it appears in the prose tracts—a phenomenon, to say the least, disquieting.

Literary history must also be brought into line. The appearance of Oriental themes in English literature has been placed at the very end of the Old English period. Wülker thinks these tracts were not translated before the middle of the eleventh century[6]. Brandl speaks of their appearance as 'die fortschrittlichste Erscheinung in der ganzen spätangelsächsischen Prosa[7].' Stopford Brooke refers to them as 'the last books, save the *Worcester Annals*, which were written in the

[1] Chambers, Introd. p. ix.

[2] He probably did not realise the value of his find. Indeed, although Junius, who had copied *Augustine's Soliloquies* and *Judith* and collated the *Gospel of Nicodemus* from this volume, must have known of the existence of *Beowulf*, there is no evidence that it excited any attention till Wanley set to work upon the manuscript in 1700.

[3] It might be supposed that, in delicate hands, the pictures from f. 98*b* onwards would yield some clue as to provenance. But they are not English in conception, and their nature and style hardly encourage the hope.

[4] M. Förster in *Archiv*, CXVII, 367 accepts the later date.

[5] Mr S. I. Rypins, who at my suggestion has undertaken an edition of the prose pieces in the second codex, with a study of the problems they raise, points out to me that Professor Sedgefield in his *Beowulf*, p. xiv, footnote, remarks that 'the first scribe also wrote the MS. immediately preceding the *Beowulf* MS. in the codex,' apparently without noticing the significance of the fact. There can be no real doubt of this identity. The script is very distinctive; and, to mention only one point of detail, the avoidance of the low or long form of *s* is remarkable in a hand which still preserves a good deal of insular character.

[6] *Grundriss*, p. 505.

[7] Paul's *Grundriss*, II, p. 1132.

literary language of Wessex[1].' But here we have them in a hand which is undoubtedly to be dated *circa* 1000; in a manuscript which is certainly not an autograph, and which seems to represent originals carrying back well into the tenth century. It would appear, then, that the introduction of these Oriental themes belongs to the great period of Continental influence which began with the tenth century, and not to the later period of Norman influence.

One point remains. In the critical examination of early English texts, the task of distinguishing forms introduced by copyists is usually baffling, and we cannot afford to overlook any source of information. So far, only *Judith*, which is in the second hand[2], has been used to throw light on the language of the scribes of *Beowulf*. But here, in the first hand, are prose texts of four times the bulk of *Judith*, free to some extent from the circumstances which make poetical texts so confusing in forms, and probably themselves due to more than one author. The detailed comparison of one with another, and of all with *Beowulf*, cannot fail to throw light on the characteristics of the first scribe, and on the explanation of the more obscure dialect forms in *Beowulf*. I need mention only one example. Genitive plurals in *-o*, which are very rare in careful West Saxon texts, occur in the part of *Beowulf* written by the first hand, e.g. l. 70 *yldo*, l. 475 *hynðo*. Surely it is no coincidence that Sievers (*Beitr.* IX, 230), and Klaeber (*Modern Language Notes* XVI, 17) quote no less than five examples from the *Letter of Alexander* which precedes in the same hand.

KENNETH SISAM.

OXFORD.

'THE SEAFARER,' ll. 97–102.

In the MS., ll. 97–102 of *The Seafarer* read:

þeah þe græf wille golde stregan
broþor his geborenum byrgan be deadum
maþmum mislicum · þ hi ne mid wille
ne mæg þære sawle þe biþ synna ful
gold to geoce for Godes egsan
þonne he hit ær hydeð þenden he her leofað.

[1] *English Literature from the Beginning to the Norman Conquest*, p. 293.

[2] Dr Chambers, *Beowulf*, Introd. p. xix, seems uncertain of the identity, but it is not doubtful. The hand is well marked, and has one feature not easily paralleled at this time: the occasional ȝ with the bar so swung downwards on the left as to form a loop similar to that of the Continental *g*; see for instance *Beowulf*, l. 2141 *þagyt*, l. 2197 *gecynde* in Zupitza's facsimile. This occurs in *girwan* on the first page of *Judith*. Of course it must not be assumed that the scribe went straight on from *Beowulf* to the *Judith* fragment as we have it.

Early editors differed considerably in their treatment of this passage, particularly ll. 97–99. Thorpe doubtfully suggested *he ne mid wille* with the meaning 'he will not that (take) with him.' Ettmüller emended (*wat ic*) *þæt he mid nylle.* Rieger wished to read *bycgan* for *byrgan,* and *þaet he ne mid wille* = 'purchase with dead treasures that he need not also die.'

As Kluge pointed out, *geborenum* presents the first difficulty. It is usually translated 'his born brother' with *brēþer* (cf. Thorpe) understood, but in this sense it is not common before Middle English. There is, however, a passage in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (Preface to *Matthew*) which lends some support to this use of the word:

ðirdda		lêce	geboren	sirisc.
Tertius	lucas	medicus	natione	Syrius.

With regard to the next difficulty, l. 99, is it possible that in *maþmum mislicum* we have a scribal error of a very common type for *maþmas mislice* (acc. pl.) due to the attraction of the preceding dative plurals *ȝeborenum* and *dēādum*? This would seem the more probable in that *byrȝan* governs an accusative.

A similar emendation *ȝemǣne* for *ȝemǣnum* has been suggested by Prof. Sievers for *Beo.* 1857.

Then *hi ne mid* might well be *hine mid* = 'with him' (*i.e.* the dead brother), for in Anglian *mid* is often followed by an accusative and this use might have been misunderstood by a West Saxon scribe.

Finally, if the contraction þ̄ is taken as representing the relative *þe* and not the usual *þæt,* a fairly clear sense is produced which agrees well with the following lines.

The whole passage then reads:

þēah þe græf wille golde strēgan,
brōþor his ȝeborenum, byrȝan be dēādum
māþm[as] misli[ce], þe hine mid wille,
ne mæȝ þǣre sāwle, þe biþ synna ful,
gold to gēōce for Godes egsan,
þonne he hit ǣr hȳdeð þenden he hēr leofað.

'Although a brother, for his born brother, will strew the grave with gold, will bury with the dead man various treasures which he (the living man) wishes (to be) with him, yet on account of the fear of God gold may be no help to the soul which is full of sin when he hides it before, while he still lives here.'

MARJORIE DAUNT.

LONDON.

Shakespeare's Italian Names.

It would be of interest to know how far Shakespeare owed his knowledge of the Italian language to personal acquaintance with Italians actually resident in London. His choice of names for some of his characters seems to indicate some such source. In the *novella* on which he founded the *Merchant of Venice*, the hero is called 'Giannetto.' Shakespeare substitutes 'Bassanio.' There were actually several Italians of that name then in London, natives of Venice, and musicians in the service of Queen Elizabeth[1].

A more curious coincidence appears in connection with a passage in *Othello*. In the First Act, where the Duke and Senators are in council, considering the defence of Cyprus and the soldiers to be employed against the Turks, the Duke puts the question:

> Marcus Luccicos, is he not in town?

The name as it stands in the Folio seems strangely distorted. Capell was the first to suggest the emendation 'Marcus *Lucchese*,' which deserves acceptance.

There was then in London an Italian called Paolo Marco Lucchese. In a list of 'Strangers' contained in the *State Papers, Domestic*, 1618, he is mentioned as 'Paolo Marco, born in Italy, in Luca[2]'; and his will is at Somerset House,—Archdeaconry of London, Reg. 6, f. 118. It is dated, 10 Dec. 1623, the testator describing himself as 'Paulo Marchi Luchese, Master of the Italian Ordinary,' in the parish of St Olaves, Hart St. He was thus, in modern terms, the proprietor of a restaurant; and Italian visitors to England lodged in his house, as appears by a passage in the *State Papers, Venetian*, vol. XVI, p. 269. Such a place would be a centre of Italian society, visited by Englishmen who desired to join it. Is it too much to suggest that Shakespeare was one of them?

John S. Smart.

Glasgow.

Thomas Heywood's Indebtedness to Stow.

I have not found it anywhere noted that Thomas Heywood, in his play *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, Part II (pr. 1606),

[1] See *The King's Musick*, edited by H. C. de Lafontaine, London, 1909, *passim*.
[2] *Foreigners Resident in England*, 1618–1688 (Camden Society), 1862, p. 63.

has borrowed a large part of his material from Stow's *Survey of London* (1598, 1603). J. P. Collier in his edition of the play for the Shakespeare Society (1851) notes correspondences between the passages dealing with the building and opening of the Royal Exchange and Stow's *Annales* (quoting from 1615 edition), but does not observe that another scene in the same play, the scene in Dean Nowell's house (pp. 94–98, Shakes. Soc. edition) is derived nearly verbally from Stow's *Survey* (pp. 107–116 and 39–40, ed. Kingsford). A short quotation may serve to illustrate the closeness of the borrowing:

Stow.

John Filpot sometime Mayor, hired with his owne money 10000. souldiers and defended the Realme from incursions of the enemie...

In the yeare 1380, Thomas of Woodstock, Thomas Percie, Hugh Calverley, Robert Knowles, and others, being sent with a great power to ayde the Duke of Brytaine, the said John Filpot hyred ships for them of his owne charges, and released the Armour, which the souldiers had pawned for their vittailes....

In the yeare 1381, William Walworth, then Maior, a most provident, valiant, and learned Citizen...etc.

Heywood.

This was the picture of Sir John Philpot, sometime Mayor.
This man at one time, at his own charge,
Levied ten thousand soldiers, guarded the realm
From the incursions of our enemies,
And in the year a thousand three hundred and eighty,
When Thomas of Woodstock, Thomas Percy, with other noblemen,
Were sent to aid the Duke of Brittany,
This said John Philpot furnish'd out four ships
At his own charges, and did release the armour
That the poor soldiers had for victuals pawned.
This man did live when Walworth was Lord Mayor,
That provident, valiant, and learned citizen,...etc.

Heywood's accounts of the building of the Royal Exchange (pp. 107–108) and of its opening (pp. 134–137) are also borrowed, not from the *Annales*, as Collier suggests, but from the *Survey* (pp. 192–193), as the closer correspondence of the wording proves: e.g. in the account of the purchase of the site, the *Annales* gives the sum paid roughly as 'certain thousands of pounds'; the *Survey* quotes the exact figure '3532 pound,' and is followed (with one obvious slip) by Heywood: 'And paid for both three thousand five hundred three and twenty pound.'

M. M. Frost.

Englefield Green.

Pope's 'Rape of the Lock' Canto I, 42.

The source of

> The light Militia of the lower sky

does not appear to have been indicated by Pope's commentators. Ultimately, no doubt, 'Militia of the sky' can be traced back to the Vulgate, in which '*militia caeli*' occurs more than ten times, the English A.V. having in almost every instance 'host of heaven.' A more immediate influence, however, may have been exercised by a passage in Sannazaro's *De partu Virginis*, I, 19 sqq.

> Tuque adeo spes fida hominum, spes fida Deorum,
> Alma Parens, quam mille acies, quaeque aetheris alti
> Militia est, totidem currus, tot signa, tubaeque,
> Tot litui comitantur, ovantique agmina gyro
> Adglomerant.

With this compare:

> Fairest of mortals, thou distinguish'd care
> Of thousand bright Inhabitants of Air!
> *R. of the L.* I, 27, 28,

and

> Know, then, unnumber'd Spirits round thee fly,
> The light Militia of the lower sky. 41, 42.

An indebtedness of Pope in the *Rape of the Lock* to Aonio Paleario's *De Animarum Immortalitate* was suggested on p. 95 in Vol. VII of this Review.

Unlikely as it might appear at first sight, such expressions in the Vulgate as '*omnis militia caeli*,' Deut. xvii. 3; II Kings xxi. 3, xxiii. 5; II Chron. xxxiii. 3, etc. and '*multitudo militiae caelestis*,' St Luke ii. 13, are ultimately responsible for the best-quoted phrase in *Tristram Shandy*. For Uncle Toby's ejaculation 'Our armies swore terribly in Flanders, but nothing to this' was provoked by the clause in Ernulphus's 'Excommunicatio': 'May all the angels and archangels, principalities and powers, and all the heavenly armies, curse him' ('*Maledicant illum omnes angeli et archangeli, principatus et potestates, omnisque militia coelestis*'), Book III, chap. xi.

Edward Bensly.

Aberystwyth.

On the meaning of 'almus' in Dante's 'Letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy' (*Epist.* v).

In the title of this letter Dante applies the epithet *almus* to the city of Rome—'universis et singulis Italiæ regibus, et senatoribus almæ urbis.' Of the two English translators of the letter, one (Latham) renders the word by 'fair,' the other (Wicksteed) by 'fostering.' The meaning of the word in classical Latin, of course, is not in doubt, and is familiar to everyone in the term *alma mater*, 'nursing mother,' applied to the Universities. But in mediaeval Latin the word bore a sense which seems somewhat remote from its etymology. By mediaeval writers it is commonly used as a synonym of *sanctus*. This, for instance, is the first meaning assigned to it in the dictionaries of Papias and Giovanni da Genova. In a mediaeval chronicle quoted by Du Cange the Emperor Ludovicus Pius is spoken of as 'Ludovicus Imperator qui cognominatus est Almus vel Sanctus.' I have come across another interesting instance in the colophons of two MSS. in the Bodleian, one of the early fourteenth century (MS. no. 11519), the other of the fifteenth (MS. no. 24436), in each of which the phrase 'gratia Pneumatis almi' occurs as the metrical equivalent of 'gratia Spiritus Sancti.'

I have little doubt that it is in this sense of *sanctus* that Dante uses the word in the title of this letter, *alma urbs* here, meaning Rome, being the exact equivalent of *urbs sancta* in *De Monarchia* II, 5, l. 106, and of *santa città* in *Convivio* IV, 5, ll. 53, 179.

Dante only uses the Latin word *almus* this once, but he twice in the *Commedia* uses *almo*, and each time in this same sense of *santo*, though modern commentators and translators for the most part give it the meaning of the classical *almus*. The first instance occurs in *Inferno* II, 20, here again applied to Rome: 'ei (i.e. Aeneas) fu dell' alma Roma e di suo impero...per padre eletto,' where Benvenuto da Imola comments: 'Roma dicitur alma urbs, idest sancta.' The second instance is in *Paradiso* XXIV, 138: 'l' ardente Spirto vi fece almi,' 'idest,' says Benvenuto, 'fecit vos sanctos.'

Paget Toynbee.

Fiveways, Burnham, Bucks.

Dante's 'Divina Commedia' and the Medieval Conception of the Comedy.

With reference to the meaning of the words tragedy and comedy in the middle ages, Jacobsen[1] says: 'Les mots drame, comédie, tragédie, s'ils ont un sens au moyen âge, présentent une acception bien différente de celle qu'ils avaient dans l'antiquité. Comme on ignorait totalement l'art dramatique proprement dit, et qu'on ne pouvait se faire une idée juste de ce qu'était un théâtre, une représentation romaine, que les savants commentateurs et compilateurs n'imaginaient pas qu'elle eût aucune parenté avec les représentations données dans les églises et peut-être ailleurs, la connaissance (probablement très rare) des pièces dramatiques de l'antiquité, en fait des seules comédies de Térence, était stérile. Si l'on distinguait encore une tragédie d'une comédie, ce n'était plus guère qu'une distinction de sujets. La formule la plus curieuse, à cet égard, a été donnée par Johannes Januensis, au XIII^e^ siècle, qui s'exprime ainsi: 'Et differunt tragoedia et comoedia, quia comoedia privatorum hominum continet facta, tragoedia regum et magnatum. Item comoedia humili stilo describitur, tragoedia alto. Item comoedia a tristibus incipit sed cum laetis desinit, tragoedia e contrario. Unde in salutatione solemus mittere et optare tragicum principium et comicum finem, id est bonum principium et laetum finem[2].'

After quoting the medieval definition of the comedy given above, Jacobsen says[3]: 'C'est dans ce sens que Dante a appelé son poème *Commedia* et qu'il a été appelé lui-même *insignis comicus, comicus noster*.' The objection to this statement lies in the fact that it assumes that the characters of Dante's poem are similar to those found in the comedy. The passages relating to the spirits that the poet meets in his other-world and his own statement regarding the title[4] of the poem make it clear that he did not intend to follow the medieval conception of the comedy in selecting the characters mentioned in the *Divina Commedia*.

In the well-known letter to Can Grande (*Epist.* x) Dante explains why he gave the title of *Commedia* to his poem:

[1] See *Revue de Philologie Française et de Littérature*, vol. xxiii, pp. 6, 7.

[2] See *Catholicon* (*trâgoedia*); Edelestand du Méril, *Poésies populaires*, 1847, p. 73; E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, vol. ii, pp. 209–11.

[3] See *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[4] With reference to the meaning of *Commedia* in the title of Dante's poem, compare J. W. Mackail's lecture on *The Divine Comedy*, published in his *Lectures on Poetry*, London, 1911, pp. 154–78.

'Libri titulus est: *Incipit Comoedia Dantis Alighierii*.... Ad cujus notitiam sciendum est, quod *comoedia* dicitur a comus, villa, et oda, quod est cantus, unde *comoedia* quasi villanus cantus. Et est comoedia genus quoddam poeticae narrationis ab omnibus aliis differens. Differt ergo a tragoedia in materia per hoc quod tragoedia in principio est admirabilis et quieta, in fine sive exitu est foetida et horribilis; et dicitur propter hoc a tragus, quod est hircus, et oda, quasi cantus hircinus, id est foetidus ad modum hirci, ut patet per Senecam in suis tragoediis. Comoedia vero inchoat asperitatem alicujus rei, sed ejus materia prospere terminatur, ut patet per Terentium in suis comoediis. Et hinc consueverunt dictatores quidam in suis salutationibus dicere loco salutis, "tragicum principium, et comicum finem." Similiter differunt in modo loquendi: elate et sublime tragoedia, comoedia vero remisse et humiliter.' (Sec. 10.)

The poet here states that he calls his poem a comedy because it ends happily and because it is written in the vulgar tongue, but does not claim that there is any resemblance between the type of characters found in the comedy and those that he places in his other-world. If he had intended to follow the comedy in this particular, he would doubtless have mentioned the fact in the letter to Can Grande, where he discusses the resemblances between his poem and the comedy. Moreover, Toynbee (*Romania*, XXVI, 543) calls attention to the fact that the definition of *comoedia* and *tragoedia* given by Dante in the passage quoted above was taken directly from Uguccione da Pisa. However, Uguccione, like Johannes Januensis, mentions as one of the characteristics of the comedy the fact that it treats of the deeds of ordinary men. It would seem therefore that Dante purposely omitted this part of his source, because he did not intend to observe this requirement of the comedy in the composition of his poem. But one may say that the absence of any reference to the characters of his poem in the letter to Can Grande is only negative evidence. Fortunately, however, the *Divine Comedy* contains some definite statements regarding the type of characters placed in the three realms that it describes. There are at least three passages that lead one to believe that Dante's plan was to select the characters that figure in his poem from the great and illustrious[1]:

> Ma dimmi della gente che procede,
> Se tu ne vedi alcun degno di nota;
> Chè solo a ciò la mia mente rifiede. (*Inf.* XX, 103–5.)

[1] See G. A. Scartazzini, *A Companion to Dante*, translated by Arthur John Butler, London, 1893, pp. 429–30.

Per ch' io al Duca mio: 'Fa' che tu trovi
Alcun ch' al fatto o al nome si conosca,
E gli occhi sì andando intorno muovi.'

(*Inf.* XXIII, 73–5.)

Questo tuo grido farà come vento,
Che le più alte cime più percote:
E ciò non fa d' onor poco argomento.
Però ti son mostrate in queste rote,
Nel monte, e nella valle dolorosa,
Pur l' anime che son di fama note:
Chè l' animo di quel ch' ode non posa,
Nè ferma fede per esemplo ch' àia
La sua radice incognita e nascosa,
Nè per altro argomento che non paia.

(*Par.* XVII, 133–42.)

OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA.

REVIEWS

The Political Prophecy in England. By RUPERT TAYLOR. New York The Columbia University Press. 1911. 8vo. xx + 165 pp.

'It is no very good symptom either of nations or individuals, that they deal much in vaticination.' So wrote Carlyle in 1829 at the outset of his essay, *Signs of the Times;* and the comparative disfavour into which this once popular art has fallen may be taken to denote, if not a sound political health, at least such approach thereto as resides in a growing intelligence. Dr Taylor's business, in the volume under review, is not to prophesy, but to record the course of prophecy; and that course limited, in the main, to English prophecy in the far past, and to a special *genre*, the political, couched under animal symbols and associated with the great name of Merlin, to which that of Galfridus Monumetensis is attached as prophet's prophet. For it is with Geoffrey of Monmouth, and what Dr Taylor calls his *Book of Merlin*, that we are mainly occupied; though with that writer and that book as traceable through a long succession. It would be preferable to say that we are occupied with the seventh of the twelve Books of Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Britanniæ*, as a few words may make clear.

At the close of his sixth Book Geoffrey has introduced his famous mage, who has no difficulty in stating the obstacle to the building of Vortigern's tower. There is a pool under the foundations, as is proved by digging; and there are two dragons asleep at the bottom of the pool, as is proved by draining: and so, amid general astonishment, ends Book VI. Book VII has but four chapters, two very short, and then two long ones. In the first Geoffrey tells us that, before this point in his composition was reached, contemporary interest in Merlin had led to a request by Bishop Alexander of Lincoln and others that he would issue an edition of Merlin's prophecies. Accordingly he translated them and sent them to the bishop with a letter, which he inserts as ch. 2. In it he says he has translated them 'de Britannico in Latinum,' interrupting his History for the purpose, though his own intention had been to have dispatched the latter first and then to have issued the prophecies, for he feared he should be unequal to pursuing two works simultaneously. The Bishop will, he trusts, excuse and correct his rude style. Then, in chap. 3, resuming his interrupted

narrative, he very briefly describes a combat which arose between the two dragons, white and red, which calls forth Vortigern's request for an explanation of the portent; and Merlin, bursting into tears, delivers his prophecy, which occupies the remainder of chap. 3 and the whole of ch. 4. Then begins Book VIII, in which Vortigern questions Merlin of his own fate, and learns that his country is to be invaded the very next day by the brothers Aurelius Ambrosius and Uther Pendragon, who will burn him in a tower. This is speedily fulfilled; and the History proceeds with the story of King Arthur up to his dismissal to Avalon in Book XI, ch. 2, and then on to Athelstan, first king of the Angles, closing with the twentieth ch. of Book XII.

The natural inference from the two short prefatory chapters of Book VII is that the translation sent to the bishop was identical with the prophecy of chh. 3 and 4, prefaced perhaps by the account of Merlin's first appearance as now embodied at the end of Book VI, and concluded possibly by Merlin's prophecy of Vortigern's end as now embodied at the beginning of Book VIII. Yet Dr Taylor persists in distinguishing (1) *The Book of Merlin* as a separate and earlier work of Geoffrey, (2) the *Historia*, and (3) the disputed Latin hexameter poem, *Vita Merlini*, of which he seems to accept Geoffrey's authorship. Dr Sebastian Evans also hinted at this separate *Book of Merlin* in his Epilogue to a translation of the *Historia* 1903 (pp. 359, 363, 365); and probably the idea has found earlier advocacy. It may be due to the phrase 'Libellus Merlini' used by Ordericus Vitalis in quoting a passage 'almost identical with a portion of the prophecies as they stand in the *Historia*' as Dr Taylor admits (p. 14). Yet 'Libellus Merlini' is a sufficiently natural description of the prophecy as given in Book VII of the *Historia*, which is considerably shorter than any preceding or following Book, save Book XI. In any case Dr Taylor admits (p. 9) that *The Book of Merlin* is lost, and its contents only to be inferred from *Historia*, VII, from 'Ordericus Vitalis' quotation, and possibly from some exegetic hints in the latter, which may, however, be Ordericus' own suggestions. How then is he justified in stating: 'In the *Book of Merlin* the prophecy is pure narrative' (p. 17); 'There is nothing of all this in the *Book of Merlin*' (p. 18); 'There is no instance of his (John of Cornwall) taking a phrase from the *Book of Merlin*' (p. 20)—and so on throughout the book? Maintaining it distinct from the *Historia*, and partly different in contents, and yet lost, how can he speak of its form and phrase? Or if by *Book of Merlin* he really means *Historia*, VII, ch. 3 and 4, where is the justification for, and what but confusion is gained by, treating them as separate works? Even if Geoffrey had issued more than one earlier edition of the prophecies, as Dr Evans suggested, the inclusion of his letter to the Bishop in the *Historia*, and the segregation of the prophecies in a separate Book with it, imply that he is simply reproducing his former work, which no trifling verbal changes, if made, could constitute another.

The real existence of that 'very ancient book' 'Britannici sermonis, quem Gualterus Oxenfordiensis archidiaconus ex Britannia advexit,' is,

Dr Taylor rightly feels, a matter he need not discuss. There may or may not have been such a book; though, if it contained all Geoffrey's matter of Arthur and Merlin, it was written long after the sixth century. It is not credible that Gildas, writing within fifty years of that 'obsessio Badonici montis, qui prope Sabrinum ostium habetur' (*De Excidio*, § 26), and speaking of it as the last slaughter the Britons endured (564 A.D.), should say nothing of Arthur or Merlin, if personages of those names played so prominent a part in those times as Geoffrey represents. Arthur first appears in Nennius's *Historia* of the early ninth century: Merlin is not found there; though the idea of sprinkling Vortigern's tower with the blood of a fatherless child, which introduces him in Geoffrey, is given by Nennius. In the three centuries and more between him and Geoffrey there is plenty of time for the growth of the great myth, the embodiment of it in some such book as Geoffrey says he had from the archdeacon, and the spread of this fabulous matter to Italy, where Pio Rajna found traces of British or Breton heroes in Italian twelfth-century names. That of Merlino, however, deceased husband of Galdia, who endowed a monastery in May 1128 (p. 41), may surely be a mere diminutive of *merlo*, a blackbird. Dr Taylor lays some stress on the different treatment of the story of Vortigern, Merlin, Uther, Gorlois and Hierna (Igerne) in Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon*, as evidence that Merlin does not make his first appearance in Geoffrey. He omits, however, at this point (pp. 41–3) to mention any date for Godfrey, who is thought to have written quite *late* in the twelfth century, as is casually noted on p. 147: nor do the differences he notes between them at all prove that Godfrey had any other source than Geoffrey. But in truth the Prophecies of VII, 3, 4 may stand without help from Archdeacon Walter's book. Geoffrey himself seems to imply a different source for them: and a sufficient one may be supposed in traditional Welsh poems like those collected by Mr W. F. Skene in *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, among which is a *Dialogue between Merlin and Taliessin*, wherein Myrdin (the Welsh form) appears foretelling the future. There are plenty of links, as Dr Taylor shows, between these poems (or perhaps their predecessors) and the Prophecy in Geoffrey. There is the use of animal symbols, some agreeing with those in the Prophecy; and the poem called *The Battle of Trees* may suggest the reference to trees in Cornwall, Gaul, or elsewhere in the later work. Moreover the confused nature of the Prophecy, reading like an attempt to combine separate utterances into a continuous whole, quite confirms the notion of an origin in traditional Welsh poetry; and probably Geoffrey, rather than the hypothetical author of Archdeacon Walter's book, was the redactor.

Indeed Merlin's Prophecy in Geoffrey corresponds closely with what Dr Taylor tells us is the general method:

> The writer dated his prophecy earlier than the real time of composition, and retold historical facts as a part of the genuine prophecy. The greater part of *The Prophecy of John of Bridlington* is a truthful account of historical events, and the prophetic part is but a small portion of the whole. It was expected that the reader,

finding the first part true, would consider the whole inspired and accept the last part as unquestionable. Furthermore the prophecies were sometimes attributed to famous scholars of an older time, as in the case of Bede and Gildas ; to popular saints as those of Thomas à Becket and John of Bridlington ; or to men already reputed as prophets, as Merlin and Thomas of Erceldoune (p. 7).

Thus only the earlier portion of Geoffrey-Merlin's 'prophecy' gives us a partially recognizable account of things. The Red Dragon overborne by the White is the British nation borne down by the Saxons. The Boar of Cornwall who succours them when oppressed, possesses the forests of Gaul, overawes the house of Romulus, and has a doubtful end, is of course *flos regum Arturus*. The rising up of the German Worm with the Wolf of the Sea, accompanied with a suppression of religion and a transference of sees, must refer to the long struggle between Saxons and Danes. The Blessed King who sets forth a navy may be taken as Alfred. The North Wind that arises later is probably the Normans, under whom the seed of the White Dragon shall bear the yoke of bondage. The two dragons that succeed are William II and Robert duke of Normandy. The Lion of Justice is Henry I, and the transforming of his whelps into fishes of the sea is supposed to mean the loss of his children in the White Ship 1120. Shortly after this point we hear of the Lynx who shall 'bring about the downfall of his own race, for through him shall Neustria lose both islands.' This, at the cost of a little pressure, may find some fulfilment in John's loss of Normandy. But we are already far beyond Geoffrey's lifetime, and need feel no surprise that the ensuing prediction of a return of the old natives' authority, the calling of the island by Brutus' name, and the disappearance of that given by the foreigners, should find little or no fulfilment. Yet we are only one-third through with the vaticination, which assumes toward the close a strongly Apocalyptic character.

Once launched, Merlin's utterance had a long history, which Dr Taylor traces with much industry and learning. Of the various modes of disguise employed—and ten are distinguished in *John of Bridlington* 1364—Geoffrey-Merlin's animal symbolism for prominent individuals seems the most persistent. Dr Taylor exhibits the modification of the Merlin matter, to suit the known facts of history, in what he calls the four major monuments of the type—to wit, the prophecies of *The Six Kings to follow John*, *Thomas à Becket*, *John of Bridlington* and *Thomas of Erceldoune*, all in their present form of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, though the *Six Kings* and *Erceldoune* are older in origin. The *Six Kings* survives in Latin (*Harleian* MS. 6148), Anglo-French (*Harl.* 746), English prose in *The Brut* (ed. F. W. D. Brie, E. E. T. S. 1906, Vol. I, pp. 73 foll.), and English verse as printed in Appendix ii to Joseph Hall's edition of Minot's poems. Dr Taylor prints the first and second in an appendix and summarises the fourth in his text. The six kings are : the Lamb of Winchester (Henry III) ; the Dragon (Edward I)—a rather amiable worm ; the Goat, with horns of silver and silk, in whose time shall flourish and perish an Eagle of Cornwall (Gaveston) ; the Lion of Windsor (Edward III) whose errand

to the Holy Land, like that assigned to his predecessor, is not easy to explain as an *ex post facto* aspiration; the Ass (Richard II) with leaden feet and other metallic members; and the Mole (Henry IV) in whose time England shall suffer a tripartite division. Shakespeare, who possibly knew the verse-form, realises Hotspur's inevitable boredom with Glendower's account of an arrangement under which both were beneficiaries. The menagerie, duly shepherded by 'the dreamer Merlin and his prophecies,' seems to have received additions—'a finless fish, a clip-wing'd griffin,' etc.; and with 'the moldwarp' is coupled 'the ant,' who nowhere figures in Dr Taylor's book. They are joined, however, in the cryptic utterances of Sybilla in Lyly's *Sapho and Phao* 1582 (II, i, 129–131), where after 'prophecies which nothing can preuent' she tenders the advice: 'Keepe not companie with Antes that haue winges, nor talke with any neare the hill of a mowle.' Winged ants appear as a proverb for ambition in Lyly's preceding comedy *Campaspe*, and the mole is probably meant as a warning against underhand intriguers: it is in fact advice to Phao 'how to vse the court and him selfe therin,' such as Wyatt gave to Sir Francis Bryan before the latter translated Guevara's *Menosprecio del Corte*, advice that might owe something to folklore no less than to the *Formicarius* of Johann Nider or the *Malleus Maleficarum*. It may not be quite unsignificant that 'the mole' is an epithet applied to 'the darksome statesman' by a later poet living on the Usk.

Prophecies of Scotch affairs—there was a collection called *The Whole Prophecie of Scotland* printed 1603—are fathered on Merlin, Bede, Bridlington, Thomas Rymour, and other respectable antecessors of the real authors: some evidence is adduced of the existence of others in Ireland, attributed e.g. to 'Patrick and Columcille': and the Welsh collection found by Giraldus Cambrensis at Nevin is still to be seen (pp. 21, 79).

Dr Taylor's study deals not only with actual early texts, but with the relation of prophecy to political events (ch. 4), its development and decline (ch. 5), and (in ch. 6) the Galfridean type in other countries, where the Sibyllan method of initials was more common than that of animal-symbolism. One may suspect that the promise of these chapter-headings is not always comprehensively carried out, and perceive that the distinction between them is not very systematically observed; yet exhaustion of such a subject was impossible, and a certain degree of overlapping inevitable. The interest of fifteenth century princes in such utterances (e.g. the Duke of York, Edward IV, Richard III) is reported in Hall or Holinshed, and reflected in Shakespeare's *II Henry VI* (I, iv, 33) and *Richard III*—the second in the latter in a Welsh connexion: and carries us on to the first printed work on the subject, Wynkyn de Worde's *A Lytel Tretys of the Byrth and Prophecyes of Merlin*, 1510. Legislation by Henry VIII 1542, Edward VI 1550, 1551, Elizabeth 1562 (pp. 105–6), shows that the use of prophecy for political purposes was still a danger to government. The present writer is reminded of a former task by Dr Taylor's citation

of the Latin prophecy which figured in the deposition of Robert Hickford against his master the Duke of Norfolk at his trial in 1571—*In exaltatione lunæ leo succumbet; et leo cum leone conjungetur, et catuli eorum regnabunt*—in which the Duke was said to have found confirmation of his ambitious hope of seating his possible children by Mary Stuart upon the English throne.

It is obvious that the essential element in the whole process was a tantalizing obscurity, sufficient to shield the *vates* from unpleasant consequences, while exciting the reader to attempts at exegesis. From the first the prophecies were accompanied, or quickly followed, by interpretations. The *Seven Kings* of John of Cornwall (1155) had such; and an elaborate one on Geoffrey's Seventh Book was supplied in 1174-9 by Alain de Lille (Alanus de Insulis). This tendency to adapt and comment makes the recorded vaticinations a reflexion of popular, especially English, sentiment at different periods (p. 86). For it needs small acquaintance with our present peasantry to understand that Latin, though used for prophetic purposes up till James I's time, had early ceased to be the exclusive vehicle. The *Here Prophecy* of *c.* 1190, says Dr Taylor, was made in English. Adam Davy's *Five Dreams about Edward II*, which anticipate that king's election as emperor and a mastery over Saracens, must be early in the reign, and show the Southern dialect (the author was of Stratford at Bow) already approximating to the East Midland. Heraldry was sometimes invoked to afford a clue to the animal-symbolism, e.g. Gaveston is the Eagle of Cornwall in the *Six Kings*, because he bore eagles on his shield. Tapestry and pictures carried the inspired message as well as prose and poetry. We are referred to Barbour's account of such a tapestry made by St Margaret, showing Edinburgh Castle scaled by a man, with motto *Gardez-vous de François*. William Lilly's *Monarchy or no Monarchy* 1651 (in England) closes with nineteen prophetic pictures for some centuries to come, a plague and fire among them. The emblem-books, Alciati's (1522), Geoffrey Whitney's (1586), Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britannia* 1612, Francis Quarles' (1635), might furnish the suggestion, perhaps the example. But the day of the prophecy was already over, and Lilly himself a leading exponent of the pseudo-science that had helped to oust it. Astrology at least could boast its rules, its basis in physical fact: Prophecy had nothing but arbitrary whim and unintelligible jargon. Sceptical Montaigne had scoffed at it (Liv. I, Ess. xi) in 1580, and Florio had Englished him in 1601. Already the English stage had joined the laugh against it, before *Henry IV*, in *The Cobler's Prophecy* (1594) and *The Pedlar's Prophecy* (1595)—Dr Taylor overlooks these recent publications of the Malone Society—the former calling himself 'one of Merlin's kinde' l. 462, the latter adverting satirically to 'King Vertyger' (353) and 'Arthur' who should 'go before the great terrible Beare' (850); though the gist of either piece, as of the anticipation of Merlin by Lear's Fool (II, 3), is the reform of purely social abuses. The accession of James I, the ascendancy of the Puritans, might in their different ways allow the *genre* a

St Martin's summer of popularity; but Bacon in 1625 follows Montaigne:

> Men marke when they hit, and never marke when they misse...almost all of them, being infinite in Number, have beene Impostures, and by idle and craftie Braines meerely contrived and faigned, after the Event Past.

Dr Taylor forgets neither Montaigne nor Bacon; and he quotes from Harington an interesting variant of the 'triviall Prophecie' heard by Bacon in his childhood, as

> After Hempe is sowen and growen
> Kings of England shall be none.

By the close of the century he reports the Galfridean type of animal vaticination as practically extinct. Yet the prophetic itch lingered on in almanacs, and lingers still. A late echo of the mighty mage is heard in Swift's 'Famous Prediction of Merlin the British Wizard written above a thousand years ago, and relating to the year 1709,' a sequel to the joke against Partridge of the year before. Its twenty lines imitate the metre and manner of the verse-form of the *Six Kings*: the ninth is:

> Then shall the Fyshe beweyle his Bosse,

the eleventh:

> Yonge Symnele shall again miscarrye,

and the last four:

> Then old Inglonde shall be no more,
> And no man shall be sorrie therefore.
> Geryon shall have thre Hedes agayne,
> Till Hapsburge makyth them but twayne.

It is a far cry to most of the work discussed by Dr Taylor, and vain to expect for his study any very wide circle of readers. Such a statement, for instance, as 'Rupescissa is said to have used this book [Alanus de Insulis' interpretation] as a basis for a commentary which Telesphorus professed to have used,' while it may open abysmal horrors to the student, is not calculated to stir the ordinary man to his inmost depths: and perhaps it was impossible in dealing with such matter to avoid a certain dulness. Nor has the omission of an index made it easier to assess the book. But the author has brought to his task a wide learning, an alert brain, a great patience: his synopsis of the study is full and clear; his references numerous and, so far as we have tested them, exact: and, where these main conditions are so fulfilled, the literary graces may, as they generally must, be dispensed with.

R. Warwick Bond.

Nottingham.

Representative English Dramas from Dryden to Sheridan. By FREDERICK TUPPER and JAMES W. TUPPER. New York, Oxford University Press. 1914. 8vo. v + 461 pp.

For a long time eighteenth century drama was a kind of Hercynian Forest which the legions had rarely penetrated, and of which only some clearings on the outskirts were known. Very few could certainly affirm what lay between the noticeable settlements of Dryden and Congreve and those of Goldsmith and Sheridan near the other end. Hazlitt, indeed, made a rapid dash across in the eighth lecture of the *Comic Writers*; Lamb made a few scornful references in his essay 'On the Tragedies of Shakespeare'; but Leigh Hunt contented himself with further developing the cleared ground, and the rest were willing to imagine rather than ascertain what wild beasts, what goblins, those gloomy recesses might conceal. Even the Master of Peterhouse, our Tacitus of 1875, closed his record with Anne's death; and we have practically refused even a literary recovery from the depreciation attending work of 'the last age,' until that age has become the last but one.

The book before us is one among several indications that the period of ignorant indifference is coming to an end. In truth there is no good reason why Elizabethan drama should engross our whole attention. Taking each product as a whole, the later has more urbanity, more polish of dialogue, more care for contrivance; and is in some respects a better mirror of its times, poorer though those times may be. To poetry it can make but small pretensions; but of life and manners it has very much, of character quite enough for interest, of wit and epigrammatic wisdom more than the other. It owes, of course, large debt to its predecessor, and it owes more to France and Spain than that to Italy. On the other hand it contributed to form that great prose Epic, the novel, the beginnings of which its predecessor had unconsciously stifled. We shall never rate it as we do the Elizabethan: its masterpieces are all too few to set beside that earlier host; and, lacking poetry, it is denied great tragedy. But it is impossible to bring against it an accusation of artificiality which will not hold good in great part against the *Tatler* and *Spectator*, against *The Vicar* and *Evelina*. A greater monotony of colour in art attends a growing sameness of life in a country increasingly commercial and increasingly unified; and what of dulness might be urged, could be urged with greater truth against the average specimen of the modern novel. In fact we have taken the poverty of eighteenth century drama largely on trust; and a volume like the present, which adopts the most effectual weapon of attack, the presentation of actual specimens, deserves a hearty welcome.

Further it deserves particular praise for the manner in which the attack is conducted. With the Editors' modest preface it is well-nigh impossible to quarrel. Their principle of choice, 'the consensus of critical and popular (eighteenth century) opinion' is the right one; nor are we much inclined to arraign the particular choice, if here and there

we may take exception to phrase or epithet in their justification of it. Their refusal of critical apparatus, and of archaic spelling or pointing, coupled as that refusal is with their assurance of a comparison of the earliest with the latest editions, was the sensible course. The reader rarely need be interrupted, or the book encumbered, with such niceties for dramatic work after 1660, when language and spelling are more fixed, and contemporary printing more efficient. The introductions to the several plays have excellently hit the mean between the meagre and the overfull. They are thoroughly informed; but they shew a power of seizing salient facts instead of wearying us with full lives: they get rapidly to business with the play itself, not omitting to mention the special source, where established, and such earlier work of the author as may best help us to understand the genesis of the piece edited; but careful mainly to remark on the characters or general effect, and the play's place in the dramatic development. Particularly good in this sense are the introductions to Otway, Farquhar and Steele. Finally the brief bibliography for each author at the end is far more serviceable than the single lengthy and ostentatious list the Editors might have felt justified in compiling.

If further remark be offered, it is quite as suggestive of a further collection by the same editors, as critical of the present book. Something was said above about 'monotony of colour' in the eighteenth century product. It is not merely a matter of language or of the style of dialogue adopted, for there is a world of difference between the lively snip-snap of Farquhar and the post-Johnsonian periods of *The Man of the World*, 1785. It lies rather in a continuity of manner in tragedy and comedy alike, a continuity never so well perceived when only a very few links in the long chain are presented for inspection. To begin with Tragedy: the present writer has been accustomed to classify it as (*a*) Heroic Plays, best represented by Dryden and Nat Lee, (*b*) the tragedy of forced pathos, as seen in Otway and Rowe, (*c*) imitative classical tragedy, begun by *Cato*, 1713, (*d*) domestic melodrama, represented by George Lillo and Edward Moore. But, in fact, the exaggeration of Dryden and Lee pervades the whole product, being felt to some extent in work so late as Cumberland's *The Carmelite* of 1784: and the effort of Otway and Rowe to return to Shakespeare and Nature, hindered in them by failing instinct, by defective psychology or lack of care for motive, or by inadequate command of moving language, was never seconded to better result. The heroics and bluster of Almanzor or Maximin are handed on through Addison's Sempronius and Young's *Busiris* of 1719. The sense of forced pathos, felt in Dryden's heroines, Almahide and Catharine for instance, is momentarily overcome by Otway's genuine emotional power, only to be reinstated by the unsatisfactory handling which brings back our sense of unreality. We cannot subscribe to the high praise so generally allotted to *Venice Preserved*, nor admit a long eighteenth century popularity as conclusive testimony to supreme merit. We consider that Byron, who admired and recalled it in both his Venetian tragedies, had recognized its inadequacy of

motive, and surpassed it in *Marino Faliero*. Admitting the truth with which a sensitive, subtle and irresolute nature is delineated in Jaffier, with which a love like his and Belvidera's is made to blossom in the wilderness; admitting the nobility of Pierre, the ability of Rénault; and asserting the atmosphere given by the degraded Antonio, the proud Priuli, the timorous Doge, the treacherous Senate; we object to an improbability in the action at several points, destructive of a perfect faith. That Otway was tied by Saint-Réal's story, does not excuse him from making his drama plausible; and we find improbability, under the circumstances, in Jaffier's bringing his wife into contact with the conspirators at all, in Belvidera's inability to follow him in his revolt, in Priuli's relenting towards the daughter he has cast off. We are conscious of strain on our belief throughout: Belvidera's madness and the needless Ghosts lower the level more than the superfluous and generally blamed buffoon scenes with Aquilina. Moreover Otway had been spoiled for blank verse by previous practice in the couplet. He is never quite convincing, never quite fine enough or moving enough to lull the critical faculty; and to speak of his style as 'restrained' or 'effortless' seems to rob those epithets of all meaning. Still his language, perhaps even his motives, are more natural than Rowe's. The latter, if he rants less, carries Otway's super-subtlety over the borderline of the absurd; as in Acts IV and V of *The Fair Penitent*, where Sciolto and his unfortunate daughter discuss whether she is or is not to pay the extreme penalty for her sin, and whether it shall be judicial or self-inflicted, until the poor girl seizes an opportune moment of the casuist's absence to effect her escape into a world of simpler feeling. There is more genuine pathos in *Jane Shore*, 1714, but still, we think, overdone. Young's work, along with the 'tyrannical' vein of *Busiris*, repeats Rowe's super-subtlety and want of nature, not only in Myron and Memnon of that play, but in *The Brothers*, composed before 1728, though not produced till 1753, for which Racine's *Mithridate* may be partly responsible. And in this same forced-pathetic class we are inclined to range Home's *Douglas* of 1756, though less chargeable with tumidity than either Rowe or Young. James Thomson's tragedies 1730–49, hovering between the heroic and the stricter classical type, are stronger in construction than Young's. The forced character is better seen in the classical *Cato* itself, spoilt by improbable love-episodes, by further improbabilities of scene, and by the subordination of action to sentiment. The heroic vein is visible in the 'towering frenzy and distraction' which the hero objects against Sempronius (Act II); the super-subtle in the relations of the brothers Marcus and Portius with Lucia in Act III. A like artificiality chills or freezes Johnson's *Irene*, the *Elfrida* and *Caractacus* of William Mason, and others of the type. In fine, of the four kinds, the realistic melodrama of Lillo and Moore was probably the healthiest in its effect on the theatre.

In Comedy the unity of temper, in spite of changes, is even greater. The perennial subject-matter of Comedy is love and love-making,

qualified in varying degree by the exhibition of other foibles, follies or humours. And the sphere in this period remains the same, the upper or upper-middle class; though lower social grades are increasingly admitted, and poverty, whether in the upper or lower class, enjoys an increasing share of the dramatist's sympathy. A main distinction must be recognized in the attitude taken by the dramatist to illicit love: but if it ceases to be extolled and rewarded, it does not cease to be portrayed —it shares in equal measure with honest love in Murphy's *Way to Keep Him*, 1760, and *The School for Scandal*, 1777. Again the proportion in which wit of dialogue, humour of situation, and interest of character are blended, varies too irregularly through the whole period 1700 to 1780 to afford a good criterion for classification. On the whole we should recognize, not four kinds, but four periods: (*a*) that of profligate Restoration wit down to Jeremy Collier's attack: (*b*) a period of more or less reformed manners, accompanied by decay of wit and entry of sentimentalism, as also of more varied interest, commencing with Farquhar and Steele, and including Mrs Centlivre's bustling merry work: (*c*) a period, commencing with Gay's comic opera 1728, when Comedy is at a very low ebb, when political and personal satire ousts dramatic interest, and stage-proprieties are freely sacrificed to the uncritical taste of the public—a period of revivals and adaptations, of the actor and theatre-manager, not of good original work. It includes Fielding's farces, Foote's caricatures, and the entry of Garrick and Colman. (*d*) A period of revival of power, wit and humour, beginning perhaps with Murphy's *Way to Keep Him*, 1760, and including Garrick and Colman's *Clandestine Marriage*, 1766, and the whole varying work of Kelly and Goldsmith, Cumberland and Sheridan.

No one will quarrel with our Editors' selection of *The Way of the World* to represent the first, or with their apology that they can include no more. Equally indispensable was *The Beaux' Stratagem*; and we are glad to note that the Editors do not endorse Mr Whibley's contention in *The Cambridge History*, that Collier's attack had no effect upon dramatic practice. The change, if incomplete, appears to us distinct in Farquhar, Cibber, and especially in Steele; and it is a change on the whole for the better, spite of some loss of wit and brilliance. The town, even without Collier, must soon have tired of perpetual popgun and cracker, and the blurring of character and plot alike in one monotonous preoccupation with intrigue. The large sentimental element in Steele is fully recognized by our Editors: he is the real founder of the school. And he is full of suggestion for later work. Bevil's duel avoided without reproach anticipates Sir Charles Grandison; and Steele's comic scenes suggest the 'low' scenes, and the Tony Lumpkin, of Goldsmith, just as Farquhar's Cherry suggests Miss Hardcastle, and the discussion of Boniface's larder by the new-come Beaux suggests that of Hardcastle's *menu*. The name Boniface for an innkeeper, however, throws farther back than Farquhar, to Ariosto's *La Scholastica*, begun 1532. We grudge their place neither to *The Beggar's Opera* nor *Tom Thumb*; though the latter is the weakest number in the

collection, and we can recognize very slight merit in the 'seventy lyrics of the former, which are poor in metre, diction and humour, and equally wanting in poetry. After Gilbert Gay's will seem tame stuff; and the habit of putting bits of dialogue into stanza-form, instead of keeping songs and duets distinct to illustrate the prose-dialogue, is frankly detestable. Gay was decidedly *felix opportunitate* in his opera as in all else; though Peachum and Lockit, the low women, and in our judgment Macheath too, are good enough.

A point we need to note is that Goldsmith and Sheridan are no sudden comets in the comic sky, but prepared by considerable 'exhalations' from Murphy and Garrick and Colman, if indeed we ought not to put our fourth period back as far as 1747. *The Way to Keep Him* (1760), if somewhat blurred by the sameness of motive which mars Restoration work, has elements of freshness in Sir Bashful and the charming Widow, and fills its preparatory Act with amusing servant-humours which perhaps remember Townley's *High Life below Stairs* of the preceding year. *The Clandestine Marriage*, 1766, is lifted by Lord Ogleby and his valets into a capital piece, with that due admixture of sentiment which English Comedy has generally affected. And, as a second point, we would note that the distinction between humorous and sentimental in eighteenth century drama may easily be exaggerated. They are juxtaposed, if not well fused, in Steele: they are mingled in the piece last-mentioned, and again in Goldsmith and Sheridan. Honeywood, Leonine and Olivia, Hastings and Miss Neville, are mainly sentimental characters: so are Faulkland and Julia, while the laugh at Lydia Languish came more heartily from sentimental Steele as he drew Miss Biddy Tipkin. The Surfaces, Charles and Joseph, as our Editors remark, are the good and bad characters of sentimental type; and Sheridan indulged himself in a debauch of sentiment when, long afterwards, he adapted his *Pizarro* (1799) from Kotzebue. In fact the protests of Goldsmith and Sheridan against sentimentalism can hardly be regarded as more than an assertion of the equal rights of wit and humour, and a desire to recommend their experience of plays by a little theorizing. Even Kelly and Cumberland, classed, then and now, as dramatic exponents of sentiment, are not overrun by it. *False Delicacy* has at least as much raillery of the superfine in feeling as exhibition of it. It is a refined comedy of errors, due to an excess of generous or delicate impulses, and corrected by the plain good sense of two friends of the parties, Mrs Harley and Cecil. There is plenty of moral tone but little moralizing in Cumberland's best comedies; and they do not lack their boisterous characters, seadog Ironsides, frank Major O'Flaherty, to look after common sense and fidelity to facts. We have to allow for the refining of manners between Swift's *Polite Conversation* (a caricature, no doubt) and the drawing-room of the last quarter of the century. Goldsmith's *Vicar* could give sentimental points, we fancy, to any character of Kelly. Evelina and her *beau idéal* Lord Orville are far more sentimental than anything in *The Brothers* or *The West Indian*. The defects of Kelly and Cumberland are that they strain

probability in incident and in pursuit of their moral, and that their dialogue is not bright enough, though Cumberland's is not without its share of vigour.

The upshot of these remarks is that eighteenth century drama is too abundant and on the whole too uniform in tone and level in merit to be adequately represented by the volume before us. While grateful for what we have, we hope for a second series, traversing the ground again, and introducing us to fresh authors. Instead of completing *The Conquest of Granada* the Editors might give us *Tyrannic Love* 1669 and *The Rehearsal* 1671: and they might add Rowe's *Fair Penitent* 1703; Cibber's *Careless Husband* 1704; brisk Susannah Centlivre's *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* 1718, near the end of her career; perhaps Fielding's *Historical Register* 1737, or another farce; Thomson's *Tancred and Sigismunda* 1745 (not on Boccaccio's and Dryden's subject), or, better, the really strong *Sophonisba* of 1730, of which few know more than the ridiculous line which passed unnoticed at the representation; Lillo's *George Barnwell* 1731 or Moore's *Gamester* 1753; Home's *Douglas* 1756; Murphy's *The Way to Keep Him* 1760; Garrick and Colman's *Clandestine Marriage* 1766; the opposed comedies, *False Delicacy* and *The Good-Natured Man*, of 1768; Cumberland's *West Indian* 1771 (better than *The Brothers* 1769) with Sheridan's *Critic* 1779; concluding with Hannah Cowley's *The Belle's Stratagem* of 1780. That list of sixteen still excludes Young's work, many marked single plays by different writers, and the whole crop of Shakespearean or Voltairean adaptations by Aaron Hill and others. That it would be inferior in dramatic or literary merit to the present collection goes without saying; but the inaccessibility of its contents would give it as warm a welcome from the widening circle of students, and, if it be true that the literary character of an age is best seen in work below the best, it would even better correspond with the present title.

R. Warwick Bond.

Nottingham.

University Drama in the Tudor Age. By Frederick S. Boas. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. 8vo. xi + 414 pp.

A series of Clark Lectures and a valuable chapter in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* have already demonstrated the intimate knowledge which Dr Boas has acquired of that fascinating by-path of Renaissance literary history, the academic drama. He now resumes the subject on an ampler canvas, and deals exhaustively both with the records of acting at Oxford and Cambridge and with the content of the surviving plays during the sixteenth century. The result is a volume of solid erudition, based on a considerable amount of research into university and college archives, as well as a patient study of the texts and their sources, and only needing the addition of a volume covering the Jacobean and Caroline periods to furnish a complete monument of the rise and

fall of one of the most remarkable of educational experiments. For it must be remembered that the Latin play at least was always an academic exercise, like the scholastic disputation which it supplemented or supplanted, and was thus enabled, in spite of the frowns of theological precisians, to maintain its footing in a society for which the mere professional varieties of the drama, still tainted with the discredit of the pagan mime, were in theory, and to some extent in practice, taboo. One of Dr Boas's most interesting chapters deals with the controversy which broke out in 1592 between William Gager of Christ Church and John Rainolds of Corpus as to the legitimacy of *mimesis* even in its most respectable form. Gager was rash enough to stage Rainolds in an after-piece as Momus, and thus opened the gates to a flood of dialectic which finally culminated in *Th' Overthrow of Stage-Playes* published by Rainolds in 1599. Gager's own temperate and reasonable defence of his position still remains in manuscript; Dr Boas quotes freely from it, but has not ventured to print it in full. Other chapters deal with the visits of Queen Elizabeth to Cambridge in 1564 and to Oxford in 1566 and 1592, and with the abundant opportunities thus offered to the playwrights; with the influence of Seneca upon academic tragedy and of Italian models upon academic comedy; and with the topical drama in English and Latin to which, under the stimulus of contemporary controversies, the Cambridge writers of the end of the century turned their attention. Dr Boas has recovered the full text of Gager's *Dido*, and devotes a considerable amount of space to examining the literary quality of this and other plays by the same writer, who is no doubt the most talented exponent of his neo-classical tradition. Throughout, indeed, Dr Boas makes a laudable attempt to treat the academic drama from the point of view of literature rather than of archaeology. Appendices give lists of performances, and so far as possible identify the recorded names of actors; and deal in detail with two pre-Elizabethan texts, whose university origin is conjectural, an *Absalon* which Dr Boas does not see his way to identifying with that of the humanist Thomas Watson of St John's, Cambridge, and the curious *Synedrium Animalium* of Ralph Worsley, which exists in both a prose and a verse form, and is based on Caxton's *History of Reynart the Foxe*.

Dr Boas does not leave much for the gleaner. He might perhaps have found room in his chronicle for the *Philotas* which, according to Samuel Daniel, was produced at St John's, Oxford, by Richard Lateware at some date before 1596, and for the 'Tragedy of Tancredo' in which, as Walton tells us, Sir Henry Wotton, while a student at Queen's College, Oxford, in 1586, gave 'an early and a solid testimony of his future abilities.' The 'poetical fancies' of Richard Eedes of Christ Church probably included, in addition to his *Caesar Interfectus*, some trifles in English, for the *Inner Temple Petyt MS.* 538, ff. 299, 300^{v}, ascribes to him 'A dialogue between Constancie and Inconstancie, spoken before the Queenes Majestie at Woodstock,' and also 'The Melancholie Knights complaint in the wood.' I have not yet had an opportunity to turn up the manuscript, but the former piece must be that printed in *The*

Phoenix Nest of 1593 and rashly attributed by Mr Bond to Lyly (*Works*, I, 458), and the latter may prove to be either the 'Chaplain's Relation' probably delivered at the same visit (Bond, I, 464) or possibly a part of the earlier Woodstock entertainment of 1575, for which it is extremely desirable to find an author. The scandalous show with which Cambridge students pursued Elizabeth to Hinchinbrook in 1564, must, I think, from the account given by the Spanish ambassador, have been a mask rather than a play; and in view of the character of the representations which had been allowed at court during the first Christmas of the reign, it is perhaps fair to suggest that the royal lady's disgust had what may be described as a diplomatic origin. Dr Boas gives an excellent summary of the difficult questions as to the date and authorship of the second *Return from Parnassus* play, although on the whole I think that the balance of evidence is in favour of 1601–2 rather than 1602–3. He rightly rejects the conjecture of John Day's authorship. If it is legitimate to add one more to the many attempts to find a man, possibly with the initial D, of whom it could be intelligibly said that 'Chessire seems to priviledge his name,' may I point out that the family of Dutton had a curious traditional privilege of jurisdiction over minstrelsy in Cheshire? I do not know whether any Dutton can be traced at St John's, Cambridge. By a slip on p. 332 'Kinsader' is identified with Lodge instead of Marston. On p. 367 Caxton's *Reynart the Foxe* is dated 1581 instead of 1481. And on p. 197 a minute piece of chronology has gone wrong through a failure to observe that in 1592, being a leap-year, Feb. 6 and not Feb. 5 was a Sunday.

E. K. Chambers.

London.

The Drama of Sensibility. A Sketch of the History of English Sentimental Comedy and Domestic Tragedy, 1696–1780. By Ernest Bernbaum. Boston and London: Ginn and Company, 1915. 8vo. viii + 288 pp.

When the wide and even elastic extent of the field covered by the phrase 'The Drama of Sensibility' is considered, and further when one recognizes how adequately Dr Bernbaum has dealt with the little read and less liked polite comedy of the mid decades of the eighteenth century, it is impossible to have anything but praise for so admirable a piece of literary history and criticism as he has just given us. Exhaustive research in arid bypaths was entailed, for, as Dr Bernbaum remarks in his preface, in order to discuss these groups of plays intelligibly it was often necessary for him to enter into minute details and to outline many plots, the knowledge of which, in dealing with rather better-known schools, he might have fairly taken for granted. The fact cannot be gainsaid that the super-refined and ultra-sentimental comedy of the eighteenth century is with certain notable exceptions

unread, simply because it is unreadable. The insipid heroines, cascading tears on every occasion, chaster than Diana or Lucrece; the impeccable heroes with their mouths full of copy-book morality delivered in sententious periods; their elegant emotions, their tremors, their hopes, their sighs and swoons, all quickly tend to become extremely tiresome and absolutely lifeless. They are guilty of the one unpardonable sin—they bore. The heavy 'Daughter of Chaos and eternal Night,' Dulness, has marked them for her own.

Dr Bernbaum with some emphasis notes the production of Colley Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* in January, 1696, as the definite starting-point of sentimental comedy. Yet this date is purely arbitrary in this connexion. Disproportionate insistence is laid on the Loveless Amanda scenes in this comedy, and, in spite of Davies' anecdote about the copious tears that were shed in the theatre, it can hardly be supposed that the audience took the reformed rake and his virtuous spouse very seriously. We are thankful to say that at any rate Sir John Vanbrugh for one did not, since to this we largely owe one of the greatest of all English comedies, *The Relapse*.

Dr Bernbaum again has much to say about the sentimental element in Mrs Behn's *The Town-Fop*. He entirely neglects to notice the sentimental episode of Bellmour and Leticia in *The Lucky Chance*, which is far more striking. The serious scenes of Lee's *The Princess of Cleve* ought to have been dealt with at some length. This is a most important play which has generally received but scant recognition.

An amazing omission from Dr Bernbaum's work is Mrs Catherine Trotter, who must undoubtedly be considered a most prominent figure in the history of the Drama of Sensibility. Some account of her life would have been useful, and her plays—in particular the 'sweet sentimental tragedy' *Agnes de Castro*—should have most certainly been analyzed and discussed.

It is hardly correct to state that 'among the tragedies of 1660–1695, it is difficult to find an instance of perfect characters exhibited in an environment that is not in some manner raised above ordinary life' (p. 54). The phrase is a little obscure, but Dr Bernbaum goes on to give *The Fatal Marriage* as an example. Porter's *The Villain*, produced at the Duke's Theatre in October, 1662 (4to 1663), Nevil Payne's *The Fatal Jealousie* (1673), and *The Orphan* might equally well be cited. In 1698 we have Catherine Trotter's *Fatal Friendship*, an entirely domestic tragedy.

In dealing with Heywood the emotional frailty of his women should have been more clearly brought out. They are sentimentalists all. As John Addington Symonds so penetratingly observes: Mrs Frankford is 'a weak and vacillating picture. She changes quite suddenly from love for her newly-wedded lord to light longing for Wendoll, and then back again to the remorse which eats her life away....In *The English Traveller* Mrs Wincott sins with the same limp and unexplained facility as Mrs Frankford. In *Edward IV* Jane Shore is meant to raise the same sentimental pity as Mrs Frankford on her death-bed.'

When Dr Bernbaum writes that Farquhar's 'style is sprightlier than Vanbrugh's, and [his] plots, though less well built, are livelier,' it is hard to believe him serious. Unfortunately an entirely spurious reputation has of late years grown up about Farquhar, who was, truth to tell, a very indifferent writer. His earliest comedy is a particularly nasty piece of work, and the rest are replete with crudities. One would not quarrel with Gildon's criticism of *The Constant Couple*, and *The Beaux' Stratagem* is a feeble echo of a more vivacious theatre. Nothing could be more absurd than the *dénouement* of this last comedy. What has kept Farquhar alive when better dramatists are almost totally forgotten is a certain mechanical knack of stage effect combined with a very tinselly flow of spirits. Why it should be so is not easy to see.

In dealing with such writers as Charles Shadwell, Charles Johnson, Edward Moore, Whitehead, Mrs Griffith, Kelly, Cumberland, and in his detailed exposition of the superiority of French sentimental comedy to English, Dr Bernbaum is often extremely happy, and gives us much of lasting value and worth. He does more than justice to the Faulkland-Julia episodes of that vastly over-rated play *The Rivals*. It must be allowed that Sheridan's sentimentality is far more awkward and dull than that of many of his contemporaries. Arthur Murphy, for example, in *All in the Wrong* manages his Belinda and Beverley with an infinitely superior skill. On the question of the influence of *She Stoops to Conquer* Dr Bernbaum finds himself in opposition to such a critic as Mr Austin Dobson, and it cannot be denied that he is well equipped to support his opinion. Personally we are inclined to think that a pretty close parallel to the effect on sentimental comedy of *She Stoops to Conquer* might be found in the effect of *The Rehearsal* on the heroic play. Both Buckingham and Goldsmith made a considerable impression indeed, but the impression they made has often been grossly exaggerated.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

TWICKENHAM.

The Life and Romances of Mrs Eliza Haywood. By GEORGE FRISBIE WHICHER. Columbia University Press. London: H. Milford. 1915. 8vo. xi + 210 pp.

It will be a long day indeed, if ever, before we get a reprint of that small proportion which is patently the best of Mrs Eliza Haywood's work, and Mr Whicher's painstaking and scholarly monograph may well claim to be a survey of untrodden ground. Even to professed students much that this indefatigable woman wrote is unknown, and there are, it must be frankly allowed, good reasons for the neglect. Her productions were extraordinarily voluminous—Mr Whicher's useful Bibliography enumerates over seventy items—and of these most are not easily accessible. It is greatly to be doubted too whether they

would be any better known, however common they might be. So soon as thirty years after her death Mrs Haywood's popularity was in a swift decline; and now Pope's scathing couplets scarce avail to save her name from oblivion. Yet the significance of her life and productions, the progress and evolution of her work from *Love in Excess* and *The British Recluse* to *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* and *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, ought not to have been ignored so completely as they have been in the past. 'Even the weakest link in the development of a literary form is important,' and Mr Whicher has done us yeoman service in devoting two hundred pages to the Ouida of her day, as Mr Gosse cleverly dubs her, an authoress who has been among the most neglected figures of the eighteenth century.

The thoroughness of this detailed study is highly to be commended. It is possible, nay probable, that some critics will see fit to belittle Mr Whicher's labours on the ground that his subject is a writer who can claim no prominent place in English literature. Paltry and insufficient reasoning, but a line of criticism which seems sadly fashionable and the obvious outcome of that slipshod superficiality which usurps the name and functions of scholarship in certain coteries of to-day.

It was Mrs Haywood's misfortune never to have been a pioneer in any branch of writing. All that she did had been done before her, and done considerably better. When she began her work the vogue of the *entretenimiento* was still strong, and her little amatory tales are just as sensational and artificial as a hundred others of the time. They neither fall below, nor do they notably advance beyond their peers. It may be well to emphasize how much these short narratives owe to the forgotten theatre of thirty and forty years before. Leanerd, Sir Francis Fane, D'Urfey, Mountfort, Dilke, and many others had written plays, more often than not founded upon *novelle* and intricate Spanish plots, the incidents of which were dished up yet once again, a true 'crambe repetita,' in the romances of the early eighteenth century. Such a comedy as *The Intrigues at Versailles; or, A Jilt in all Humours*—the very name is significant—some scenes of which are already derived from *The Double Cuckold*, requires but the flimsiest formal alteration to become a completely typical novel of the Haywood school. Even the nomenclature of the Dramatis Personae, Sanserre, Guillamour, Count de Brissac, Madame de Vandosme, Sir Blunder Bosse, is near akin to Mrs Haywood's Dorante, Bellcour, Count d'Elmont, Madame de Villesache, Grubguard.

When we compare Mrs Haywood's 'Secret Histories' and *romans à clef* with those of Mrs Manley we are at once convinced of the superiority of the latter. Although *The New Atalantis* and *The Adventures of Rivella* have of necessity lost their piquancy for us, nevertheless Mrs Manley possesses a style, a wit, a power of rapid narration, and above all a certain neat facility in sketching character, which are lacking in the laboured *Memoirs of a Certain Island adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia*. The amours and adventures of Windusius and the 'luxurious Duchess' (Dss. N—d), the History of Graciana

(Miss Ch—ld), the intrigues of Bellario (E—ce B—l) with the 'Most Passionate and Ever Faithful' Luina (Mrs L—nn), with the 'most passionately devoted' Alma (Lady A. L—), with Bellimante, Clio and the rest, although clearly meant to be irresistibly and elegantly seductive, romantic and pathetic, are all too unreal and outworn; the style, an impure Gongorism, becomes ineffably tedious, the fopperies shallow and silly, the sentiment trivial and debased. Mrs Haywood's gentlemen may wear velvet coat and powdered periwig, her ladies trail silken gown and flutter painted fan, but their manners and morals are those of hectors and pot-house gillians.

We could have wished that Mr Whicher had taken the opportunity to give us a few pages on the very interesting pedigree of such 'Secret Histories.' They need not always be blameable as the correct Mlle de Scudéri showed in *Le Grand Cyrus* and *Clélie*, and sometimes they have great merit, even when so indiscreet as *Hattigé, ou la Belle Turque*, whose theme is the gallantries of the Duchess of Cleveland.

From the writing of 'Scandal Novels' to Marivaudage would seem to be an almost impossible change, yet Mrs Haywood accomplished it with no little success, for in *Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) she certainly reached the high-water mark of her achievements. Overshadowed by its greater contemporaries, *Betsy Thoughtless* has never received the general approbation it deserves. Yet we may remember that Smollett's Captain Miniken recommended it amongst 'modern authors that are worth reading,' that Lady Mary Wortley Montagu found it entertaining enough, and Dunlop, no mean critic, adjudged it considerable merit. Here too we are bound to join issue with Mr Whicher. It seems to us that he a little underrates the value of Mrs Haywood's best novel, and in so doing he quite naturally finds himself unable to agree that it afforded a hint for *Evelina*. Yet, as Dunlop points out with some care, the parallel is often very close; too close, we think, to be purely accidental. Nor can we see how a trifling suggestion derived from the pages of Mrs Haywood can in any way impair the originality and excellence of Miss Burney's infinitely superior art.

Merely imitative as she was, Mrs Haywood was none the less immensely popular throughout her long career, a fact too often lost sight of by later critics, and it is a strangely interesting, if faded, figure that Mr Whicher has presented to us. The various analyses of the novels and the ample bibliography are valuable. It was in fine a work worth doing, and it has indubitably been well done.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

TWICKENHAM.

On the Art of Writing. Lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge, 1913—1914. By Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH. Cambridge: University Press. 8vo. viii + 251 pp.

Few things are more tempting to a literary man, but experience seems to show that nothing is more difficult, than to write about style. To take two modern instances, the late Walter Pater's style nowhere shows to so little advantage as in his essay on that subject, and though Sir Walter Raleigh's book on style won much admiration by its brilliant qualities it is probably the least felicitous of his writings and is assuredly not to be recommended to beginners in the art as a model for imitation. 'Q' comes out of the ordeal very well. It is true that he has deliberately chosen the lecturer's style rather than the essayist's and has left in his manuscript those transitions, parentheses and *iuncturae* which are more appropriate to the lecture-room than to finished writing; but his argument and his practical counsels gain so much from being composed with the eye upon a living audience that few will be disposed to think he would have done better to recast his work before publication. For the bane of writing about style is that the subject almost inevitably induces a self-consciousness which leads to over-elaboration, over-subtlety and obscurity. Writing for an undergraduate audience, and with the constant memory (as many touches show) of his own feelings at the undergraduate age—an age of generous enthusiasm but likewise of remorseless criticism—'Q' generally conforms to his own wise precept to prefer the concrete word to the abstract. We are never left in doubt as to his meaning: and thus two of the greatest virtues of style are at once assured—sincerity and clearness.

Possibly, as he seems to feel in his own preface, his tone is a little unnecessarily polemical. Is it that he is nervous lest by other professors he should be esteemed an amateur, whereas he feels, not unnaturally, that in speaking on the literary art he has the long and successful practice of a life-time behind his thoughts and words? Well, if any *a priori* criticism was passed at the time on the appointment of a popular novelist to a Cambridge professorship, the sound quality of these lectures should serve to lay its ghost. They are the product of a mind steeped in English literature and choosing the best in prose and verse with a sure discrimination. They abound in felicitous and unhackneyed quotation and allusion. And their main thesis—that the descent of English literature is from the ancient cultures of Greece and Rome more than from northern sources—is a doctrine that is good to be preached, if only because, under Germanic influence, the other side has for many years been unduly emphasised in England. True, since the war began there has been a reaction, sometimes foolish and ungenerous. These lectures were delivered before the war and owe nothing to that reaction. The classical case is urged without extravagance. The admiration which the author professes for the art of William Morris may be accepted as proof of his literary catholicity.

Of actual rules for guidance in the art of writing 'Q' gives singularly few. The chief are these three.

'(1) Almost always prefer the concrete word to the abstract.

'(2) Almost always prefer the direct word to the circumlocution.

'(3) Generally use transitive verbs, that strike their object; and use them in the active voice, eschewing the stationary passive, with its little auxiliary *its's* and *was's*, and its participles getting into the light of your adjectives, which should be few.'

To other rules laid down by the authors of *The King's English*—'Prefer the short word to the long' and 'Prefer the Saxon word to the Romance'—'Q' demurs as 'false in theory and likely to be fatal in practice.' The moment we leave narrative and try to philosophise, we must go, as he says, to the Mediterranean languages. Nor is it only for diction that we must go to them. 'Were this University to limit me to three texts on which to preach English literature to you, I should choose the Bible in our Authorised Version, Shakespeare, and Homer (though it were but in a prose translation).' The educational value of these lectures, in truth, consists not so much in definite rules as in the lecturer's strong sense of the literary tradition and the greatness of great art. The teacher who impresses this upon the younger generation is rendering the best of all possible services.

But perhaps a pedant lurks somewhere in the breast of every educated man—even of a professor whose pet foible is to attack the pedantry of other professors. It is amusing to see Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's wrath at the application of the term 'antibody' to a species of microbe—'a barbarism and a mongrel at that'; 'the man who uses it debases the currency of learning'; 'for our own self-respect, whilst we retain any sense of intellectual pedigree, "antibody" is no word to throw even at a bacillus.' The occasion is hardly adequate for such strong words. The objection to hybrids was not felt by Shakespeare and Milton; it is of modern growth and may easily be pressed too far; the prefixes *re*, *pro*, *anti*, in particular, have thoroughly established themselves in the English language and acquired the right to be used without thought of the origin of the word with which they are compounded.

J. H. Fowler.

Clifton, Bristol.

Collected Papers of Henry Sweet. Arranged by H. C. Wyld. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1913. 8vo. x + 590 pp.

This selection from the shorter writings of Henry Sweet was made 'at the request and with the approval of his wife,' and no more fitting editor could have been found than the most distinguished of his English pupils. Of the papers themselves it is difficult to speak for, as the editor himself reminds us, 'it would be mere impertinence to praise them now,' and, one may add, it would be equally impertinent to blame

them because, here and there, in the light of further knowledge and material now attainable, some statement may perchance no longer hold good. One must content oneself rather with indicating the contents of this collection and their importance in enabling us to realise, in some measure at least, all that we owe to their author.

The first group of papers consists of three on the study of language generally. Here we realise how, from as far back as 1876, Sweet stood in the forefront of those who have endeavoured 'to get at a more philosophical interpretation of the phenomena of speech' and have insisted on the recognition of 'a science of *living* as opposed to dead, or antiquarian philology, based on phonology and psychology.'

Then follow five papers on the 'Progress of Linguistic Science.' They are reprinted from the *Transactions of the Philological Society*, and consist for the most part of reviews of the progress of philological studies during certain years or of the position attained in the study of some particular problem. How greatly it would be to the advantage of the present-day student if amid the multiplicity of theses, programmes, monographs etc. of scholars of all nationalities, he could avail himself of the guidance of one who could write something which was not a mere review but a truly critical survey, in which success and failure were recorded with equal certainty and impartiality!

In the papers on the history of Old English we realise more acutely perhaps than in any other of the groups how pre-eminently Sweet was a pioneer. He laid the foundations upon which all future work in Old English had to be built if it were to be of any value. Unlike the present-day student Sweet had no basis from which to start: such papers as the one on 'Dialects and prehistoric forms of Old English' did not and could not owe anything to predecessors, for no work worthy of the name had as yet been done.

The final section consists of papers on the study of Phonetics and its application to the study of spoken languages. It is probable that it will be as a phonetician that Sweet will be longest remembered, for while there are many who cannot realise what the historical study of our language owes to him, no one who has any understanding of the problems of modern-language teaching and the way in which they are now met, can fail to realise the debt which linguistic study on its most practical side owes to the late Henry Sweet.

One other paper remains to be mentioned, viz., that on *Shelley's Nature Poetry*. Here we realise that Sweet was not only a scientific philologist but a lover of humane letters, gifted with an appreciation for literature which was based on keen and penetrating judgment. It traces the beginnings of Nature-Poetry in the days of the *Rig-Veda*, discusses its growth in Celtic and Old English Literature, marks its limitations in the hands of Chaucer, Spenser and Shakespeare, and the great advance it made in Milton's *stimmungsbilder*, notes the development of an appreciation for the wilder aspects of nature in the eighteenth century, and finally discusses the characteristics of the work of Shelley as a nature poet. These last he takes to be 'his breadth of

view, his sense of structure, his love of the changing and fleeting, his myth-creating faculty, his treatment of light and colour.' Would that all philologists of Teutonic birth, when they endeavour to lecture or write upon English literature, might show so just, so true and so sympathetic an appreciation of poetry!

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Parts of the Body in Older Germanic and Scandinavian. By TORILD W. ARNOLDSON. (*Linguistic Studies in Germanic*, II.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Cambridge: University Press. 1915. 8vo. xii + 217 pp.

If it is true that the history of language is the autobiography of the human race, then semasiology must be one of its longest and most interesting chapters. Unhappily this autobiography, so candid and so unconscious, is in a complex cipher and little has as yet been translated. The more welcome, therefore, are such contributions as the one before us. It covers but a small part of the field of research in a single one of the families of Indogermanic languages, but it is remarkably rich in those self-revelations which are the charm of autobiography.

The plan of Mr Arnoldson's work is well adapted to the end which semasiology has in view, though it might have been more kind to the reader not to leave him to find out for himself what the plan is. Apparently the various names of the different parts of the body in the several Germanic languages are classified in head-groups, each one of which shows the development in meaning from some original 'idea' to the meaning contained in the name of the part of the body. Wherever a word still exists retaining this original meaning or 'idea' it is also given. This purely semantic head-group is further subdivided into etymological groups, though this is only for the purpose of systematic classification, and not because it claims to be a contribution to etymology. The material so displayed affords an admirable illustration of the fascination which the study of words may exercise. Here indeed is a racial autobiography. Here we may see, for example,—what we cannot see anywhere else—that the mind of the modern Swedish peasant works in exactly the same way as did the mind of his Viking ancestor. The point of view may change; the range of objects of thought—and with it the complexity of associations of ideas—may have widened, but still the same fundamental processes of naming things, and of the thinking about them which is revealed in such a process of naming, remain the same. There is here abundant evidence, too, that language change is something more than the product of mere sound-change. It is clear from the evidence here presented that such change is due to the simple fact that the human mind reacts to its surroundings, reflects those surroundings in speech, either in new words or in old

words with new meanings—is due, in fact, to the deliberate creative effort of the imagination.

To the student of language, who wishes to discover the laws by which language develops, not less than to the student of psychology, who wishes to discover the laws of human thought, and who of late years has derived such powerful assistance from the material of language, this study, and the series of which it is a part, will be very welcome. But both will regret that its usefulness has been so much impaired by the omission of an index. Such a study as this is clearly only material, very valuable material, it is true, but still material of many shapes and forms, and it is a pity that anyone who in future sets out to build with it should be obliged to rummage through the whole work for each single bit of material he requires. This is the most serious criticism which can be brought against Mr Arnoldson's work: it is a point of vital importance. More easily to be forgiven is a certain inconsistency in method. We notice that in his translations of old Germanic words Mr Arnoldson sometimes uses an English and sometimes a German word. In the case of the names of concrete objects—and most of the names in this study are of that kind—this does not matter so very much, though there are objections to it in principle. But in the translation of abstract terms it becomes of primary importance that there should be a norm if there is to be any accurate comparison. Everybody knows, and nobody better than the semasiologist, that *ami*, *friend* and *Freund*, though dictionary equivalents, are far from having the same semantic values; hence to translate one old Germanic word by *ami* and another by *friend* is to deprive us of the means of accurate comparison, and may lead to serious misapprehensions. In any case we should still need a common denominator for *ami* and *friend*.

The material surveyed is derived from all the Germanic languages in their older stages, and in the case of Norse and High German also from more modern times and from dialects. Much the fullest treatment is accorded to the modern Swedish dialects, and they are of special interest for the fulness and variety of method in language development which they reveal. It is to be hoped that the further volume on the same subject which is promised in the series for the later stages of the Germanic languages will complete the picture so well begun.

We notice under 65. 16 a misprint *stackass* which should read *stackars*. Under 1. 17 we are not quite satisfied with the etymology of Swedish slang *grötkulan* = *gröt* ~ *gryta*, 'pot' + *kula*, 'ball, bullet.' Although the correspondence *ö* ~ *y* is possible in the dialects, it would seem more in accordance with the semantic value of *grötkula* to resolve it into *gröt*, 'porridge' + *kula*, 'ball,' 'bullet,' or, as we should say, 'pudding head.'

The volume is handsomely produced, both paper and printing are excellent, and the display on the page is both clear and pleasing.

E. Classen

London.

Russian Prosody [О русскомъ стихосложеніи]. By Baron D. G. Günzburg. Edited, with an Introduction, by G. M. Kniazev. Petrograd. 1915. 8vo. lxiii + 268 pp.

Of the small number of students of Russian prosody who, dissatisfied with the traditional teaching and its 'rules,' have tried to find out for themselves the secrets of verse harmony, the late Baron D. Günzburg ranks as one of the most learned and enthusiastic. It is now nearly a quarter of a century since his studies of Arabic and Persian metric were published, and right up to his death in 1910 he was engaged in laborious analysis of the verse of many literatures, ancient as well as modern. In the book we are noticing he intended to give to the world the fruits of his researches with special reference to Russian verse, supported by a detailed analysis of Lermontov's poetry. Death cut short his devoted labours before he was able to round them off, but not before he had completed the analysis upon which his conclusions were to rest. He would, we feel sure, have rejoiced that so capable and sympathetic an editor as M. Kniazev should have undertaken to prepare his work for the press.

Russian prosody has especial interest for students of English metric. In Russian as in English, word-stress and sentence-stress are the dominant factors in speech-rhythm. But there are in some respects wide differences between the accentual systems of the two languages. In ordinary spoken Russian there is in every word of more than one syllable only one strong stress. There is a greater tendency than in English to hurry over less strongly stressed syllables, the vowels of which either become obscure or are changed to other vowels with no loss of distinctness. This is of course nothing else than the 'ablaut' of Indo-European grammar. In the reading aloud of Russian verse, vowels not strongly stressed in ordinary speech acquire greater prominence and sonority; grades of stress appear; on occasion a secondary stress may rise to a full stress. The rise in tone on a syllable with a strong logical (ethos) stress in a verse-line is considerably higher in Russian than in English. Further, in Russian verse, words of four or five syllables are common even in lyrics; in English verse, except in Milton's epics, they are rare. In speaking of Russian verse we must bear in mind that there are two entirely different types of versification in use, (1) the literary, based originally, like the English, on French models; and (2) the popular, as represented by the *byliny* or folk-tales. The latter type has been used by some poets such as Nekrásov, but can hardly be said to have influenced the literary type at all; it is meant to be chanted, not read.

Russian literary versification during the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth century passed through the same stages as did that of our own poetry during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. We find in Russia the same crude early efforts in imitation of the French system, no less crude than those of the early Middle English poets, though made by cultured versifiers. There is the same

forcing of the stress-rhythm of the natural speech into the Procrustean bed of syllabic verse, and the same final compromise between the two systems, whereby in the best poetry the natural speech-rhythm has free play in the line consisting of a prescribed number of syllables[1]. Chaucer went rather further than Pushkin and Lermontov and most of their successors in the direction of metrical 'license.' But we know that Pushkin felt dissatisfied with contemporary versification or at least with the 'four-foot' octosyllabic line, the favourite metre of Russian poets. 'Everybody writes it,' he wrote; 'it is time to leave it to children as a game.' This dissatisfaction with the traditional literary verse-forms has been expressed or at least felt by Russian poets and critics since Pushkin, but it is only in quite recent times that experiments in new forms have been made and a fresh and unprejudiced search undertaken for new principles based on actual analysis of poetry. Much that is interesting and even illuminating has been written on Russian prosody by Andreevski, Biely, Nedobrovo, Tšudovski, Lukianov and others.

Baron Günzburg's main thesis, to which he was led by Guyard's studies on Arabic metre, as he himself acknowledges, is that verse is systematised rhythm, and that the laws of verse-rhythm are identical with those of music-rhythm. This of course is no new idea in itself; what is interesting is to see how it works when applied to Russian poetry. So convinced is Günzburg of the truth of his theory that he says (p. 85), 'Verse-lines should be of such construction that they may be read to the accompaniment of a metronome;...the syllables which bear logical stress synchronising with the beats of the instrument.' This statement can hardly be meant to be taken in a literal sense, since it does not always fit in with the accentuation which Günzburg himself gives to the lines of Lermontov's verse which he analyses in great detail in the second half of the book. Thus then, after a preliminary tilt at the traditional principle of scansion by syllables, does the Baron reveal himself as the possessor of a rival theory which he wants to put in its place.

Günzburg did not apply his theory to Russian poetry until he had convinced himself that it held good for all European verse, both ancient and modern, as well as for Semitic verse. In his interesting Introduction, itself almost a treatise, Kniazev gives examples of the application of Günzburg's theory to Latin hexameters, to the favourite thirteen-syllable line of Polish poetry, and to the French alexandrine. The last is regarded as forming two bars in either $\frac{4}{4}$ or $\frac{6}{8}$ time. In order to show that the number of syllables is not the really important thing in French verse Günzburg prints Lamartine's *Harmonies* side by side with Kol'tsóv's *Song of the Ploughman*, with the stressed syllables marked in all the lines of each poem. He asserts that the rhythm of the two poems is identical, but so far as we are capable of judging

[1] The Russian language is rich in rhymes like the English of Chaucer's day. Blank verse has been written by Russian poets, but it is not popular.

there is no similarity whatever. Still, we are ready to admit that the music-rhythm theory applies better to French verse than to verse written in some other languages. Whether it applies to the verse of dead languages is not in a modern man's power to determine, but we feel convinced that it fits Russian verse (even as read by Günzburg) no better than it fits English verse.

The analysis of Lermontov's versification, which takes up something like 150 pages, is disappointing, being of the nature of a running accompaniment of commentary professing to trace each variation of the poet's mood and of his thought, and so to justify the accentuation imposed on the lines examined. This method is not scientific, and does not advance our knowledge of the secrets of Lermontov's verse very much, but it is interesting 'while it lasts.' We are reminded somewhat of the 'annotated' programme of an up-to-date concert. Like some other writers on prosody, Günzburg gives the impression that he has paid little if any attention to the manner in which other people read verse; he apparently founds his theory on, or at least supports it by, his own manner of reading. We will give two specimens. The first is from *Evgenii Oniegin*:

Былъ вéчеръ. Небо мéркло. Вóды
Струились тйхо. Жýкъ жужжáлъ.
Ýжъ расходúлись хоровóды,
Ужъ за рѣкóй дымáсь пылáлъ
Огóнь рыбáчій. Въ полѣ чистомъ,
Луны́ при свѣтѣ серебристомъ,
Въ свой мечты́ погружена́,
Татья́на дóлго шла одна́[1].

Günzburg observes here that each line of this octosyllabic verse, consisting of two bars of four units each, has three and never more than three stresses, of which sometimes one, sometimes two are full stresses. As regards the number of stresses in the lines of this particular poem, we think he is right on the whole, though he does not explain why the noun полѣ in the fifth line has no stress at all. Perhaps he would have said that полѣ чистомъ is equivalent to a single word.

In the second specimen taken from another poem by Pushkin, we think Günzburg's reading is less acceptable:

У лукомóрья дýбъ зелёный
Златáя цѣпь на дубѣ тóмъ;
И днёмъ и нóчью котъ учёный
Все хóдитъ пó цѣпи кругóмъ;
Идетъ напрáво—пѣснь завóдитъ,
Налѣво—сказку говорúтъ.

In these lines Günzburg's theory does not seem to work. He tries to justify his accentuation, but fails to convince. We cannot believe that words like дубѣ and котъ have no stress.

[1] A dot above a vowel denotes a less prominent stress.

Kniazev, who does his duty as an editor and explainer of Günzburg's theories most efficiently, is not on very firm ground in his short incursion into phonetics (pp. xxxii—xxxvi); he is stronger in music, some rudiments of which he thinks it necessary to supply. Yet he calmly asserts that 'the French word *table* = ta-bᵉ-le can be represented musically thus:

.' To sum up: though the book under notice does not advance the study of Russian prosody very appreciably, it certainly contains much that is interesting, bearing witness as it does to Baron Günzburg's indefatigable learning and enthusiasm.

In conclusion we may perhaps be allowed to suggest that some interesting and possibly valuable results might be obtained if a student of metric, instead of confining his observations to his own reading of verse, were to approach our poets and induce them to read their poetry to him or at least to furnish him with phonographic records for detailed examination. The reading of sympathetic poetry-lovers not themselves poets might also be recorded, even as we record the 'renderings' by artistes of musical compositions. With a mass of material of this kind the trained phonetician with a love of good verse might have some chance of placing the study of metric on a scientific, because an objective, basis.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

MINOR NOTICES.

Professor Ernest de Sélincourt, in his four lectures on *English Poets and the National Ideal* (Oxford: University Press, 1915), enlists Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, and other writers in the existing warfare of political ideals, and manages to fit their patriotic emotions and teachings into the present crisis without dropping into moral anachronisms or forcing historical comparisons. He sometimes allows himself dangerously modern expressions like 'jingo'; but when he tells us (p. 42) that Milton 'held firmly to the doctrine of the survival of the fittest,' he takes the sting out by the explanation: Milton held that only the righteous nation, in the long run, can endure. It may be that Mr de Sélincourt reads too much latent statecraft (p. 10) into the frail historical (which is little more than a dramatic) background of plays like the *Comedy of Errors*; but he aptly describes the mixture of aristocratic sentiment—I would rather call it *gentle* sentiment—and of broad human equity that distinguishes the poet. He thinks that Shakespeare, in his pictures of the English kings, is glancing—nay, that his 'eye is firmly fixed in reprobation' (p. 30) on the counter-pattern, so widely current in his day, of the Machiavellian *Principe*. We do not know; enough that if his eye *had* been thus fixed, he would hardly have drawn his picture otherwise than he does. Milton and Wordsworth provide an easier text, and Mr de Sélincourt draws skilfully on both poets, and especially on their still too unfamiliar

prose. The democratic 'stalk of carle-hemp' in Wordsworth, which is easily obscured by his later Toryism, is brought out with refreshing clearness. The fourth discourse opens with Byron and Shelley, strikes a just balance in the case of Tennyson, and ends with Meredith. What really comes out is, that these classical writers have more to say about the present crisis than any poet of to-day. Mr de Sélincourt easily finds aliment in most of them for his own creed, which appears to be that of a sober idealist, a liberal of the older stamp. The poets, at any rate from Milton onwards, teach the interconnexion of liberty, righteousness, and national discipline; the duty of the stronger country to maintain for the weaker the rights that in its own case it cherishes; and the call for unity in defence. Mr de Sélincourt, in a lighter moment, quotes from the *Times* the prologue spoken in Leipzig at a performance of the *Winter's Tale* (Oct. 1914). The German Pecksniff, Ernst Hardt, announces that Shakespeare has instructed him to say that he, Shakespeare, is 'homeless' now in England, and that he gives thanks to Germany for not leaving him wholly 'unapprehended.'

O. E.

Nothing could be better than the little selection called *The Patriotic Poetry of William Wordsworth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915) made with the help of Mr A. C. Bradley by the Rt. Hon. A. H. D. Acland, and dedicated 'To Edward Grey, a life-long lover of Wordsworth.' The selection consists of thirty-two of the 'Poems dedicated to National Independence and Liberty,' together with 'The World is too much with us,' 'In the Pass of Killicranky,' 'Stanzas written in expectation of the death of Mr Fox,' and, noblest of all, 'The Happy Warrior.' Mr Acland in undertaking this little work has of course had in view the circumstances of the present hour. 'It is of real service to us to have a reminder, in this splendid form, that a dogged and united determination to hold on at whatever cost and if need be for years together, without letting the heart droop or fail, must lead in the end to victory.' In a charming and simply written Introduction Mr Acland traces the early history of Wordsworth's mind and shows how his patriotism was the outcome of his belief in the value of the human soul kept sound and vital by the ministry of nature. With each poem is a note, in which the circumstances which gave birth to it are told with scholarly accuracy. We believe that there are now in our army hundreds or thousands of young scholar-soldiers who would treasure this handy little book as their best companion in the weary life of the trenches, and who would be grateful all their life long for the opportunity of getting the poems by heart.

G. C. M. S.

Mr J. G. Jennings, in *Metaphor in Poetry* (Glasgow and Bombay: Blackie and Son, 1915), argues that the poetical use of metaphor is not prompted by the logical desire for clearness of illustration.

We do not hear Shelley's skylark the better for having it compared to a poet, a high-born maiden, a glow-worm and a rose. Metaphor, in other words, is not illustrative but ornamental, designed to express the complexity of the Universe, 'which can truly be depicted only by a complex portraiture.' Dr Johnson said of metaphor that it gives us 'two ideas for one' and this double nature of metaphor 'presenting unity and diversity simultaneously renders it an apt image of a world which is at once one and manifold.' We agree with Mr Jennings that the poetical use of metaphor has very little to do with the need for clearer illustration, but is the source of our enjoyment really so recondite? Do we not simply enjoy the beautiful image for its beauty, and the variety for its variety, and the analogy for the pleasure of recognition, and the sequence of various beauties and analogies for the beauty, variety and analogy combined? And is any more recondite explanation required? If so the theory, which Mr Jennings offers, is certainly wide enough to cover the facts.

In a sensible passage Mr Jennings contends that the variety secured by poetical metaphor must be 'really appropriate.' The images must blend, as note blends with note in musical harmony and colour blends with colour on the artist's canvas. And he takes Keats' sonnet 'On first looking into Chapman's Homer' as an example of successful blending, contrasting with it the concluding sonnet of George Meredith's *Modern Love*, 'Thus piteously Love closed what he begat,' of which last piece we learn that 'there is here practically no architectonic power displayed.' We have nothing to advance against the first illustration, but it is surprising that so competent a judge as Mr Jennings should find no 'architectonic power' in the Meredith sonnet. Surely there is here architectonic power of the very highest order, the quick succession of sharp contrasted images being designedly employed to bring out the restless, self-questioning spirit of the lovers. We hope that Mr Jennings will reconsider his verdict on this particular poem.

H. A. L. F.

Instead of attempting a comprehensive or evolutionary method of selection, which too often tends to become tedious or pretentious, Messrs H. F. Stewart and Arthur Tilley, the editors of *The French Romanticists* (Cambridge: University Press, 1914) have been guided by their good taste and scholarly inclination. The result is a suggestive and useful anthology. There are half-a-dozen misprints, not more perhaps than might be reasonably expected in a French book set up by English printers (*e.g.*, page 29, note, line 3; p. 47, l. 5; p. 84, l. 5; p. 97, n., l. 2; p. 224, n., ll. 2 and 3). The editors are doubtless already aware of them and will correct them in a second edition. Some of the opinions expressed in the notes are open to challenge (*e.g.*, pp. 5, 70 and 89). This book ought to be read by the light of *The Romantic Movement in French Literature* (the same editors, Cambridge: University Press, 1910). Indeed, few courses of lectures or so-called literary histories will prove as helpful as these two companion volumes to students

who wish to attain a somewhat original conception of the theory and practice of the Romantic Movement in French Literature.

D. G.

The spirited translations of Portuguese poems in Mr George Young's *Portugal. An Anthology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916) range from the early lyrics to Portugal's chief living poet, Snr. Guerra Junqueiro. If certain mistranslations, the repeated spelling Guerro Junqueiro, the choice of 1000 A.D. as a starting-point (1189 is the date of the earliest-known poem in Portuguese) betoken no very deep acquaintance with the subject, the book as a whole bears witness to the growing interest in Portuguese literature which has been too long neglected in England. Over a quarter of Mr Young's book is devoted to Gil Vicente, a poet entirely unknown to English readers two years ago. His mystic *Auto da Alma* is here given in an abridged rendering.

A. B.

It was worth while to translate into English *A New Drama* (New York: Hisp. Society, 1915) partly because *Un Drama Nuevo* is the most important of the works of the skilful Spanish playwright Manuel Tamayo y Baus (1829–98), partly because the characters are English—Shakespeare, Yorick, Walton. It is thus the easier to judge of the merits of the play in the adequate rendering by Mr John Driscoll Fitz-Gerald and the late Thacher Howland Guild (No. 90 of the *Publications of the Hispanic Society of America*). Without agreeing with Mr Fitz-Gerald, who in his introduction speaks of it as 'one of the great plays of all literature' and of its characters as 'drawn with the exquisite art of a great master,' it will be readily granted that in this play within a play Tamayo y Baus utilized to the full his lifelong familiarity with the stage, and that the interest, if sometimes a little obvious, is well sustained. Shakespeare's universal sympathy is brought out, but the tragedy contains scarcely a vestige of humour, which is as rarely absent in real life as in Shakespeare.

A. B.

The interest in Russia that has grown up during the present war has produced a large number of Grammars and hand-books to the Russian language; but most of them are of very slight scientific value. The fullest and most scientific of these books is Mr Nevill Forbes' *Russian Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914). Not the least valuable part of it is the bibliography of scientific grammars and dictionaries published in other countries. Mr Forbes has a wide experience of the Slavonic languages and their pronunciation, and his hints on the subject, as for instance the close resemblance in sound of hard ы to English *w*, are of practical value, but the phonetic part of the book is weaker than the syntactical part. This Grammar is to be followed by a series of shorter hand-books of which one (*First Russian Book*. By Nevill Forbes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915) has appeared. This little book is original and useful to the student in that it treats the language without touching the complicated question of the verb, which is to be dealt with in a second book.

Mr M. B. Karrachy-Smitt's *Lessons in Russian* (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co., 1915) is a short graduated course for students, partly based on Mr Forbes' Grammar. Colonel Alister Jamieson's *Line-upon-Line Russian Reader* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.) is of slight value, and is disfigured by an incorrect system of transliteration. мнѣ becomes *mnyay*, моложе, *malojhay*, which convey a totally false impression of the sound; while in English *sch* does not represent Russian щ. It is good to find that both Mr Forbes and Mr Karrachy-Smitt use the transliteration scheme of the Liverpool School of Russian Studies. There has been such chaos in the writing of Russian names in English that any attempt at systematisation is an advance, and the tendency is for all institutions to adopt one of the two or three schemes that have been formulated. It is high time that bastard forms like *Koutousow* and *Tschaikowski* should disappear. It is obvious to all who know Russian that any attempt to describe the exact sounds must be inadequate. Even such a good scholar as Mr Forbes is very vague; for instance, when he says that the sound ы is like English *y* in Whitby. This does not express the swelling of the lips which accompanies the Russian sound. Mr Karrachy-Smitt is mistaken in saying that this sound is found also in Polish. The Polish *y* is much more like our *y* in Whitby than ы. Another great difficulty in Russian, the aspects of the verb, is well explained by Mr Forbes; but Lowe's *Systematisation of the Russian Verb*, though slightly out of date, still remains the most comprehensive work on the subject.

A Serbian Grammar is much needed at the present time, and there has been none in England since that by Professor Morfill published in 1887. The *English-Serbian Phrase-Book* by Mr Louis Cahen and Mr Forbes (Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1915) is a mere phrase-book for travellers, and is of no scientific interest. In the short introduction the authors fail to mention Slovene as one of the South Slav languages. It is very inaccurate to say that č and ć, dž and dj have the same sounds.

A. B. B.

The greatest part of Polish literature is written in verse and so is inaccessible to the foreigner. But modern Poland has plenty of translatable prose, and the little volume of *Tales by Polish Authors* (H. Sienkiewicz, S. Żeromski, A. Szymański, W. Sieroszewski), translated by Else C. M. Benecke (Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1915) is very welcome, giving as it does a very representative collection of the short stories in which the latest writers excel. The work of selection and translation is well done, but the explanations are very bad. The list of Polish letters at the beginning is inadequate and does not explain a word found on the second page. The names of the Polish villages which mean 'Oppression,' 'Misery' and 'Wrong' are not translated. It is not stated that 'as long as we live' on p. 35 is from the Polish national song, and the note on p. 4 says that Skrzyniecki fought in the revolution of 1863 instead of 1830.

A. B. B.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

December, 1915—May, 1916.

GENERAL.

GALLETTI, A., Saggi e studi. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. 5 L.

HECKEL, H., Das Don Juan-Problema in der neueren Dichtung. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XLVII.) Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler. 6 M.

JENNINGS, J. G., An Essay on Metaphor in Poetry. Glasgow, Blackie. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

LA GRASSERIE, R. DE, Étude de grammaire comparée. Du caractère concret de plusieurs familles linguistiques américaines. Paris, Maisonneuve. 10 fr.

MOULTON, R. G., The Modern Study of Literature. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10*s.* net.

SAND, M., The History of the Harlequinade. 2 vols. London, M. Secker. 25*s.* net.

WHITMORE, C. E., The Supernatural in Tragedy. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Latin.

The Cambridge Songs. A Goliard's Song book of the 11th century. Ed. by K. Breul. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 21*s.* net.

Italian.

ARETINO, P., Il secondo libro delle lettere, a cura di F. Nicolini. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, LXXVI.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

ARIOSTO, L., Orlando furioso, secondo l' edizione del 1532, col commento di P. Papini. Nuova ristampa. Florence, Sansoni. 10 L.

BAMBAGLIOLI, G., Il Commento dantesco di Graziolo de' Bambaglioli dal Colombano di Siviglia con altri codici raffrontato. Contributo di A. Fiammazzo all' edizione critica. Savona, Bertolotto. 12 L.

BARBIERA, R., I poeti italiani del secolo XIX. Antologia, con proemio, biografie, e note. Milan, Treves. 8 L.

BERTOLI, L., La fortuna del Petrarca in Francia. Nella prima età del secolo XIX. Livorno, R. Giusti. 3 L.

CANTONI, R., L'Alfieri a Siena. Florence, B. Seeber. 5 L.

CARDUCCI, G., Rime e ritmi, con note di A. Saletti. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. 1 L. 50.

Carducci, G., Storie e leggende, con note di A. Albertazzi e A. Cesari. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. 1 L.

Croce, B., Scritti di storia letteraria e politica. vii. I teatri di Napoli dal Rinascimento alla fine del secolo xviii. Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Cuoco, V., Platone in Italia, a cura di F. Nicolini. i. (Scrittori d' Italia, lxxiv.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

De Lafontaine, H. C., Dante and war. London, Constable. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Galiani, F., Della moneta, a cura di F. Nicolini. (Scrittori d' Italia, lxxiii.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Hauvette, H., Les études italiennes. (La science française.) Paris, Libr. Larousse. 50 c.

Malagóli, G., La letteratura vernacola pisana posteriore al Fucini, con note linguistiche e glossario. Pisa, R. Bemporad. 3 L.

Natali, G., Idee, costumi, uomini del Settecento : studii e saggi letterari. Turin, Soc. tip.-editr. nazionale. 6 L.

Palmieri, R., Studi di lirica toscana anteriore a Dante. Florence, L. Olschki. 2 L.

Parini, G., Prose, a cura di E. Bellorini. ii. (Scrittori d' Italia, lxxi.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Passerini, G. L., Il vocabolario carducciano, con due appendici ai vocabolari dannunziani e al pascoliano dello stesso autore. Bologna, Sansoni. 4 L.

Prati, G., Poesie varie, a cura di O. Malagodi. i. (Scrittori d' Italia, lxxv.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Rimatori bolognesi del trecento, a cura di L. Frati. Bologna, Romagnoli dall' Acqua. 11 L.

Rimatori siculo-toscani del dugento. Serie i. Pistoiesi-lucchesi e Pisani, a cura di G. Zaccagnini e A. Parducci. (Scrittori d' Italia, lxxii.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Russo, L., P. Metastasio. Pisa, E. Spoerri. 10 L.

Spanish.

Antología de poetisas liricas, i, ii. (Biblioteca selecta de Clásicos españoles.) Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. Each 3 pes. 50.

Armas, J., El Quijote y su época. Madrid, Imp. Renacimiento. 3 pes. 50.

Barnils, P., Textes catalans avec leur transcription phonétique. (Biblioteca Filológica, v.) 4 pes.

Cancionero castellano del siglo xv. ii. (Nueva Biblioteca de Autores españoles, xx.) Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 12 pes.

Catila y Dimna, La antigua versión castellana del, cotejada con el original árabe de la misma. (Biblioteca selecta de Clásicos españoles.) Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 3 pes. 50.

Cotarelo y Valledor, E., El teatro de Cervantes. Estudio crítico. Madrid, Imp. de Archivos. 12 pes.

Crawford, J. P. W., The Spanish pastoral drama. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Diccionari Aguiló. Materials lexicográfics aplegats per M. Aguiló i Fuster. (Biblioteca Filológica, iii.) Barcelona, Institut d' etudis catalans. Fasc. i, ii. Each 4 pes.

Guevara, A. de, Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea. Edición y notas de M. Martínez de Burgos. (Clásicos castellanos, xxix.) Madrid, La Lectura.

Heredia, N., La sensibilidad en la poesia castellana. Madrid, J. Pueyo. 3 pes. 50.

Martinenche, E., Les études hispaniques. (La science française.) Paris, Libr. Larousse. 50 c.

Ramírez Ángel, E., José Zorrilla. Madrid, Yagües. 3 pes. 50.

Salcedo Ruiz, A., La literatura española. Resumen de historia critica. 2da ed. i, ii. Madrid, Calleja. Each 8 pes.

Suarès, A., Cervantès. Paris, Emile Paul. 3 fr. 50.

Tamayo y Baus, M., A New Drama (Un drama nuevo). Transl. by J. D. Fitz-Gerald and T. H. Guild. New York, Hispanic Society. 1 dol. 75.

Portuguese.

Portugal. An Anthology. With English versions by G. Young and a Preface by Th. Braga. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

French.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Dey, W. M., The Latin Prefix pro- in French. (Studies in Philology xii, 4.) Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina.

Levertin, O., Fransk litteraturhistoria, ii. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 3 kr. 50.

Nyrop, K., Philologie française, publ. et annotée. 2e édit. Paris, Picard. 3 fr.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Guiot de Provins, Les Œuvres, ed. by John Orr. (Manchester Univ. French Series.) London, Longmans. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jeanroy, A., Les études sur la littérature française au moyen âge. (La science française.) Paris, Libr. Larousse. 50 c.

Sternberg, E., Das Tragische in den Chansons de geste. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Chinard, G., Notes sur le Voyage de Chateaubriand en Amérique, juillet—décembre 1791. (Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, iv, 2.) Berkeley, Univ. of California Press. 80 cents.

Elder, M., Deux Essais : O. Mirbeau, R. Rolland. Paris, Crès. 3 fr.

Kurz, H., European characters in French drama of the eighteenth century. London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lanson, G., Les études sur la littérature française moderne. (La science française.) Paris, Libr. Larousse. 50 c.

Lowell, A., Six French Poets. Studies in Contemporary Literature. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Matthey, H., Essai sur le merveilleux dans la littérature française depuis 1800. Paris, Payot. 3 fr. 50.

Novati, F., Stendhal e l' anima italiana. Milan, Cogliati. 5 L.

Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, George Sand, étude bibliographique sur ses œuvres. Paris, H. Leclerc. 5 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

ARNOLDSON, T. W., Parts of the Body in Older Germanic and Scandinavian. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* net.

DICKINS, BRUCE, Runic and heroic poems of the old Teutonic peoples. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6*s.* net.

HUSTVEDT, S. B., Ballad Criticism in Scandinavia and Great Britain during the 18th century. London, H. Milford. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

WIENER, L., Commentary on the Germanic Laws and mediaeval documents Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 14*s.* net.

Scandinavian.

Alfræði islenzk. Islandsk encyklopædisk Litteratur. II. Rímtql. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved N. Beckman og K. Kålund. II. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 9 kr.

BJØRNSON, B., Poems and Songs. Transl. by A. H. Palmer. (Scandinavian Classics, III.) New York, American-Scandinavian Foundation. 1 dol. 50.

BRIX, H., Blicher-Studier. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 kr.

Danske Studier. Udg. af M. Kristensen og A. Olrik for Universitetsjubilæets danske samfund. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr.

EWALD, J., Samlede Skrifter, udg. af H. Brix og V. Kuhr. III. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 kr. 50.

HELVIG, AMALIA VON, Bref til Atterbom. Utg. af H. Atterbom-Svenson. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 3 kr. 75.

HOLMSTRØM, M., H. C. Andersen. Liv och diktning. Stockholm, Åhlen och Åkerlund. 7 kr.

JENSØNS, CHRISTEN, Den norske Dictionarium eller Glosebog. I ny utgave ved T. Hannaas. (Ældre norske Sprogminder, III.) Christiania, J. Dybwad. 2 kr. 40.

LEOPOLD, C. G. AF, Samlade Skrifter. Utg. af K. Fredlund. IV, V. (Svenska Författare, II.) Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 5 kr. 25 and 4 kr. 50.

LIE, J. og hans samtidige. Breve i udvalg ved C. Nærup. Christiania, Gyldendal. 4 kr. 75.

LUCIDOR, Samlade dikter. Udg. av F. Sandwall. II. (Svenska Författare, IV.) Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 5 kr.

ŒHLENSCHLÄGER, A., Ungdomserindringer. Udgivne af L. Bobé. Copenhagen, Lybecker. 4 kr. 50.

PERSONNE, N., Svenska Teatern. III. Under Karl Johanstiden, 1810–1818. Stockholm, Wahlstrøm och Widstrand. 3 kr. 75.

STAGNELIUS, E. J., Samlade Skrifter. Udg. af F. Böök. IV. (Svenska Författare, III.) Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 12 kr.

STRINDBERG, A., Master Olaf. Transl. from the Swedish by E. Björkman. (Scandinavian Classics, IV.) New York, American-Scandinavian Foundation. 1 dol. 50.

Dutch.

KALFF, G., Literatuur en tooneel te Amsterdam in de zeventiende eeuw. 2e druk. Haarlem, F. Bohn. 2 fl. 90.

KALFF, G., Studiën over Nederlandsche dichters der zeventiende eeuw. 2e druk. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink. 2 fl. 50.

ZIJDERVELD, A., De romancepoëzie in Noord-Nederland van 1780 tot 1830. Amsterdam, A. H. Kruyt. 3 fl. 50.

English.

(*a*) *General (incl. Language).*

JACKSON, C. E., The Place-names of Durham. London, Allen and Unwin. 5*s.* net.

LEGOUIS, L., Les études anglaises. (La science française.) Paris, Libr. Larousse. 50 c.

Oxford English Dictionary, The. IX. Subterraneously—Sullen. Ed. by C. T. Onions. London, H. Milford. 2*s.* 6*d.*

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

GÖRNEMANN, G., Zur Verfasserschaft und Entstehungsgeschichte von 'Piers the Plowman.' (Anglistische Forschungen, XLVIII.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 4 M.

HALL, J. R. CLARK, A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary for the use of Students. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15*s.* net.

KITTREDGE, G. L., A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight. London, H. Milford. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

TOLLER, T. N., Supplement to Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Part II. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Assumption of the Virgin, The, a Miracle play from the N. Town Cycle. Edited by W. W. Greg. London, H. Milford. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

BAKER, A. E., A Tennyson Dictionary. London, G. Routledge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

BAXTER, J. P., The Greatest of Literary Problems : the authorship of the Shakespeare works. London, Constable. 21*s.* net.

BERNBAUM, E., The Drama of Sensibility. A Sketch of the History of English Sentimental Comedy and Domestic Tragedy, 1696–1780. (Harvard Studies in English, III.) Boston, Mass., Ginn and Co.

BINKERT, D., Historische Romane vor Walter Scott. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M. 60.

BUTLER, S., The Note-books of. Selected, arranged and edited by H. F. Jones. London, Fifield. 5*s.* net.

Cambridge History of English Literature, The. Ed. by Sir A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. XII. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 9*s.* net.

CARGILL, A., Shakespeare the player, and other papers. London, A. Constable. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

CHILD, H., Thomas Hardy. London, Nisbet. 1*s.* net.

CRUSE, A., Sir Walter Scott. London, G. G. Harrap. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

DRAWCANSIR, A. (H. FIELDING), The Covent Garden Journal. Ed. by G. E. Jensen. 2 vols. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford, 21*s.* net.

DUFFIN, H. C., Thomas Hardy : a study of the Wessex Novels. London, Longmans. 5*s.* net.

ERSKINE, Mrs S., Anna Jameson : letters and friendships, 1812–60. London, T. Fisher Unwin. 15*s.* net.

FORD, J., 'Tis Pity she's a Whore, and The Broken Heart. Ed. by S. P. Sherman. (Belles-lettres Series.) London, G. G. Harrap. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gollancz, I., A Book of Homage to Shakespeare, ed. by. London, H. Milford. 21*s.* net.

Gordon, A. L., Poems. Including several never before printed. Arranged by D. Sladen. London, Constable. 3*s.* net.

Gosse, E., Two Pioneers of Romanticism, Joseph and Thomas Warton. (British Academy.) London, H. Milford. 1*s.* net.

Harper, G. M., William Wordsworth, his life, works, and influence. 2 vols. London, Murray. 24*s.* net.

Hone, J. M., W. B. Yeats: the Poet in contemporary Ireland. Dublin, Maunsel. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hopkins, R. T., Rudyard Kipling: a literary appreciation. London, Simpkin Marshall. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jones, E. D., English critical essays, ed. by. (World's Classics.) London, H. Milford. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

Jordan, J. C., Robert Greene. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Kent, S., The People in Shakespere's Sonnets. London, J. Long. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Koster, E. B., William Shakespeare. Gedenkboek 1616–1916. The Hague, G. A. Kottmann. 1 fl. 50.

Krapp, G. P., The Rise of English Literary Prose. London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lee, Sir Sidney, Life of William Shakespeare. New ed. London, Smith Elder. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lounsbury, T. R., The Life and Times of Tennyson (1809–50). New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Madden, D. H., Shakespeare and his fellows; an attempt to decipher the man and his nature. London, Smith Elder. 6*s.* net.

Saintsbury, G., The Peace of the Augustans. London, G. Bell. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Shakespeare, W., The Tragedy of King Richard II. Reproduced in facsimile from the Quarto ed. of 1598 in the Library of W. A. White of New York. With an introduction by A. W. Pollard. London, B. Quaritch. 15*s.* net.

Sieper, E., Die altenglische Elegie. Strassburg, Trübner. 8 M. 50.

Skemp, A. R., Robert Browning. (People's Books.) London, Jack. 6*d.* net.

Stoll, E. E., Othello: an Historical and Comparative Study. (Univ. of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature, II.) Minneapolis. 50 cents.

Stopes, C. C., Shakespeare's Industry. London, G. Bell. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Thomas, E., Keats. (People's Books.) London, Jack. 6*d.* net.

Thorndike, A. H., Shakespeare's Theater. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Toynbee, P., The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West and Ashton, 1734–1771, edited by. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 25*s.* net.

Treble, H. A., English prose, narrative, descriptive and dramatic, ed. by. (World's Classics.) London, H. Milford. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

Wicher, G. F., The Life and Romances of Mrs Eliza Haywood. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Woods, M. A., Studies in Shakespeare. London, Truslove and Hanson. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

German.

Bossert, A., Un Prussien libéré. Herder, sa vie et son œuvre. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Buchta, A., Das Religiöse in Clemens Brentanos Werken. Breslau, F. Goerlich. 6 M.

Fiedler, H. G., Book of German Verse from Luther to Liliencron. London, H. Milford. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Fischer, M., Heinrich Heine. Der deutsche Jude. Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta. 80 pf.

Galetti, G., Le affinità elletive del Goethe come espressione di una crisi pessimistica. Milan, Studio edit. Lombardo. 3 L

Grillparzer, F., Werke, herausg. von A. Sauer. III. Abt., 1. Vienna, Gerlach und Wiedling. 8 kr. 50.

Hauch, E. F., Gottfried Keller as a democratic idealist. London, H. Milford. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hoffmann, E. T. A., Tagebücher und literarische Entwürfe, herausg. von H. von Müller. I. Berlin, G. Paetel. 10 M.

Hülle, J., J. V. Pietsch: sein Leben und seine Werke. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, L.) Weimar, A. Duncker. 5 M. 50.

Keller, G., Briefe und Tagebücher, 1830–61. Herausg. von E. Ermatinger. Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta. 13 M. 50.

Kohut, A., E. Geibel als Mensch und Dichter. Berlin, A. Schall. 4 M.

Meyenburg, E., Quellenstudien zu J. H. Voss' Oden. Berlin, E. Ebering. 2 M. 20.

Rudolf von Ems, Weltchronik, herausg. von G. Ehrismann. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, XX.) Berlin, Weidmann. 25 M.

Scheidweiler, P., Der Roman der deutschen Romantik. Leipzig, G. B. Teubner. 4 M.

Storm, Th., Briefe an seine Frau, herausg. von G. Storm. Brunswick, G. Westermann. 4 M. 50.

Thomas-San-Galli, W. A., Goethe: die Pyramide seines Daseins. Munich, A. Hertz. 8 M.

Völcker, B., Die Hamlet-Darstellungen D. Chodowieckis und ihr Quellenwert für die deutsche Theatergeschichte des 18. Jahrh. (Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen, XXIX.) Hamburg, L. Voss. 9 M.

Weber, M. E., Passages in Prose and Verse from the German literature of the nineteenth century, 1800–70. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* net.

Wustmann, R., Weimar und Deutschland 1815, 1915. (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, XXX.) Weimar, Goethe-Gesellschaft.

VOLUME XI OCTOBER, 1916 NUMBER 4

THE INFLUENCE OF TRANSMISSION ON THE ENGLISH BALLADS.

POPULAR poetry, that is, traditional poetry which has survived by oral transmission among the common people, may be conveniently divided into two classes: poems in which rhythm and mimicry are predominant, and poems in which action and situation are the chief objects. Into the first class fall dance-songs, singing games, songs of work, and (at a venture) the now meaningless refrains of some ballads. Into the other class fall the various kinds of ballads—border, outlaw, Robin Hood, and simple. In this discussion it will be convenient to limit our observations chiefly to the simple ballads, because they afford us a certainty of long transmission which may be observed at work in different periods. The same method might be applied to the other classes of popular poetry, if an equal amount of material were available. But the transmission of Robin Hood ballads stopped centuries ago, and children's lore has too often been interfered with by print or by the interposition of adults to admit of careful analysis.

Popular poetry, by definition, can survive only by oral transmission. Plato, lost, may be found centuries later, and may again influence the world; but the unprinted ballads, once out of oral tradition, are lost for ever. Hence the ballad is peculiarly dependent on the memories and tastes of the people who repeat it and listen to it, for it is capable of constant change in their hands. Indeed, we may say that a traditional poem is reborn each time it is transmitted to a new generation. Now it is clear that oral transmission requires a narrator and a listener, who form a group. It is in the unity of interest which such a group manifests, and in the act of transmission within this group, that we shall seek for an explanation of the peculiarities of our English ballads.

Different elements of group-consciousness may function in the same individual. A child, singing with other children, becomes part of the group which perpetuates 'King William was King James's son.' The

same child, away from the group, may recite snatches of Longfellow or sing the songs of nature and of childhood which he has learned at school. The mother at home may tell fairy stories, though she reads Browning at the club. These groups are usually quite distinct, unless the mind is shaken from its course. Sir Toby in a night of drunkenness sang an old ballad; Ophelia in her madness reverted to the songs of her childhood nurse; Falstaff on his death-bed became a boy again, and 'babbled o' green fields.' It would be difficult to imagine Falstaff or Sir Toby, in good health and soberness of mind, with the different groups of consciousness intact and separate, dreaming of childhood memories or singing childhood songs.

Because illiteracy tends to shut out the influence of other groups, it helps to preserve the ballads. Constant association of the members of the group acts in the same way. An old Scotchman once told me that he used to sing 'The Queer Folk o' the Shaws' when Rob was there, but he couldn't remember a line of it after the latter had gone. Together, they both remembered the song; separated, one of them had forgotten it completely. For a like reason we find the ballads so often 'pocketed,' surviving only in some secluded group which has long remained intact, as on a ship, a ranch, or a mountain. Unity of interest operates in the same way: Dana, a Harvard college man, sang ditties with illiterate sailors on shipboard. Because they more readily adapt themselves to the group, some collectors of popular poetry are more successful than others, and are permitted to hear songs which are never mentioned in the presence of other visitors. This necessary group-consciousness is seriously affected when money is used as an inducement, as in the case of Buchan's blind beggar. Scott was wiser when he, with a keg and a night of good fellowship, secured priceless ballads. But even Scott attempted to hasten the collection of ballads at times, and met with disastrous results.

Indeed, it is not unfair to suppose that the attention which collectors have given popular poetry has hastened the decline of oral transmission. The Romantic Movement, with its search for popular lore, was especially fatal to the natural life of the unconscious ballad-group. Presumably the ballads were near their best in the early eighteenth century; by the middle of the nineteenth they were almost a thing of the past. Wherever the collector went, a century ago, he found the ballad just disappearing, like Lamia before the eye of the philosopher. The reason for this is simple: the ballad can live only by oral transmission, which requires complete acceptance on the part of the auditors. Printed

books of various beliefs may combat each other, and still thrive side by side on the library shelves. The popular poem is not so hardy. As a child's belief in Santa Claus, the whole fabric trembles in the presence of a single doubting mind.

The group is never creative, but its influence on the poetry which it transmits is due to the factors of memory and selection. Let us consider them in order, to see how they have influenced some of the better known ballads which have come down to us.

As we have implied by definition, popular poetry will be perpetuated only so long as it is remembered by the singer and accepted by the group. There are certain factors at work in the mind of the singer to destroy or to sustain his memory of the ballads. In the first place, there is a natural tendency to obliviscence, by which things of a year ago tend to make way for things of the present moment. Again, changes take place in the meaning or pronunciation of words, thereby obscuring the singer's memory. Similarly, words which lack associative significance are likely to drop out and be replaced by something else, especially in the case of proper names and obsolete words. Lastly, the memory of the singer is weakened by the loss of some accompanying feature of the ballad, as the dance, the tune, or the background of the story, or by the loss of a sympathetic audience or of the custom of singing. In Europe the dance has for centuries been of little value to stimulate ballad singing, but the loss of the tunes is much more significant; for the tune serves to hold the ballad in shape, to preserve the proper sense of form. The background is lost by emigration, or by a lapse of time. The loss of the audience or of the habit of singing may result from any one of three things: a change in popular taste, actual separation of the ballad-group, by death or migration of its members, or the psychical separation of the group. A change in popular taste may make the public indifferent to the ballads and the singer cautious about repeating his songs. The psychical separation is most often due to contact with strangers, or to the influence of written literature.

The singer's memory is not left unaided, however; otherwise the ballads would have been lost at an early time. There is a natural tendency to reminiscence which goes far toward offsetting the tendency to obliviscence. Things which have slipped from the active memory tend to return, or to be easily recalled at intervals. This tendency has been investigated by Ballard[1], who employed ballad poetry to test the

[1] Philip B. Ballard, 'Obliviscence and Reminiscence,' *The British Journal of Psychology*, 1913, Monograph Supplements, Vol. I.

memory of subjects from six to twenty years old. He concluded that there is an actual improvement of the memory after the lapse of a few days, and that there is for a long time a marked power of reminiscence. This reminiscence is more active among old and consolidated associations than among those recently established. He concluded that this reminiscence is due to neural growth, which is most rapid during childhood and adolescence. Hence it is clear why there is such a strong tendency to revert to the memories of childhood. As children are the most eager listeners, it is natural that ballads are most often learned in childhood and remembered through life.

A second factor to assist the singer's memory is the presence of other singers to enforce the traditional version. With years of literary training behind me, I never learned to sing the Harvard football songs by the book. I glanced over the printed pages many times, but it was only on the field that I learned the songs. Here another factor is involved: the singing of a crowd is not distinct, and so I had many of the words wrong until I corrected my oral version by comparing it with that in the book. I was unable to remember one of the songs when away from the crowd, since it depended too much on rhythm for merely literary memory. But the ballad-singers usually had no text for comparison; and when the group was broken up, the song was likely to be lost.

A third factor which aids the balladist is the method of utterance. The tunes are easy to remember; and once remembered, they serve to preserve the stanzaic form of the poem. Even where the ballads are not sung, they are recited in a rhythmic chant which serves much the same purpose. The rhythm of the dance is no doubt a factor in preserving the words of singing games, but it has had little bearing on the ballads of our acquaintance. There was formerly a common practice in Scotland of singing different words to the same tune. In the Banks' Islands, on the contrary, the tune is variable and the words relatively fixed. In the Scotch ballads, the tune long ago became not an object in itself but a means of survival.

In this connection it may be noted that memory from auditory presentation is far greater than memory from visual presentation[1], for the reason that greater attention is required to hear than to read. Even where the visual memory is strengthened by auditory or motor memory, it is still inferior to the memory of what has been heard. Consequently the method of oral transmission, depending entirely on auditory memory,

[1] V. A. C. Henmon, 'The Relation between Mode of Presentation and Attention,' *The Psychological Review*, Vol. XIX, No. 2, p. 94.

may be considered capable of securing the most permanent impression upon the mind of the hearer.

Again, the memory of the singer is supported by associations connected with the ballad, such as references to familiar geography or to popular history, in the border ballads; to popular mythology and customs, in the simple ballads; and the use of well-established phrases in all cases. If the horse has silver shoes before, it is easy to remember that he has gold ones behind. If the lord orders his black horses saddled, it is certain that he will continue with a similar order for the brown ones. When this formula is clearly understood, even the dullest can fill in the details.

Most important of all, the expectations of the group act as a conservative force to prevent the singer from taking undue liberties with his material. We have examples of this to-day in the indignant protest of the child, 'That isn't the way Nurse told it,' and in the custom of the Eskimos, who 'closely watch the teller of stories of the kind, lest he diverge, even by a word, from the time-honoured form[1].' The ballad-singers are unable to create anything equal to the songs which they have received, and they have nothing else to supply their need of fiction. Their imaginative life secures its chief expression in the ballads. Hence it is that we find the ballads still surviving, after all the life has gone out of them, instead of giving way to new ones. Until their place is taken by other things, or until the ballad-group becomes so changed that the old lore is no longer suited to the needs of the former auditors, the ballads can hardly be lost entirely.

Nevertheless, they have been undergoing steady disintegration for at least a century and a half. Where they were collected and printed in one community, and were left untouched elsewhere, the later versions are usually inferior in poetic quality, and are frequently but faint recollections of the original story. This is partly due to the increasingly low average of intelligence among those who transmit the ballads. Although I cannot subscribe to the belief that servants in the nineteenth century averaged much lower than servants in the sixteenth century, it must be remembered that the early ballad-group included creative individuals who, in a later and more literate time, would have been drawn into the stream of literary influence. 'Inglorious Miltons' were less likely to remain illiterate and obscure in the reign of Victoria than in that of Queen Bess.

A striking example of ballad survival has recently come to my

[1] Ernst Grosse, *The Beginnings of Art*, New York, 1897, p. 276 f.

attention, during an investigation of the folk-lore of St Clair County, Illinois. Early in the eighteenth century a family of Scotch Presbyterians came to this country, bringing with them a traditional version of 'Mary Hamilton.' They had no books of poetry except the Psalter, and their rigid moral standards could hardly be considered favourable to the preservation of such a ballad. But this particular story appealed to the strongest instinct of the group, their family pride; for they claimed descent from the chief families mentioned in the ballad—the Hamiltons and the Stewarts—and they felt a secret joy in this traditional record of their family history. As long as their group-consciousness remained intact, they preserved the ballad throughout their wanderings; for its appeal did not depend on locality or custom, but on family pride. Printed versions did not reach them, since they lived for generations on the frontier. Then they settled down in Illinois, where they were brought into contact with the outside world by the coming of railroads, the public schools, and the foreigners. From this time on, the ballad was rarely sung. All the family knew the story, and it was still whispered among them that King James himself was the father of the murdered child; but actual singing ceased a generation ago. The youngest of the children who heard it sung, now a grown woman of middle age, recalls but a single stanza, which still rings with pathos after three and a half centuries:

> Last nicht the Queen had four Maries,
> This nicht she'll hae but three;
> There was Mary Seton, and Mary Beton,
> And Mary Carmichael, and me[1].

Since we have seen something of the nature of the ballad-group, and summarized the larger principles which seem to control the process of transmission, let us take up in detail some of the more significant characteristics which have been produced in the ballads.

All popular poems have the semblance of anonymity, to such an extent that the Romanticists regarded them as the product of The People, and more recent writers have refurbished the same doctrine in a more scientific form. We must not be misled by the lack of a known author, for it is a natural result of popular currency. Douglas's 'Annie Laurie' is, for most people, anonymous, and is actually so printed in many song-books. Popular acknowledgment of authorship rarely goes beyond a hazy 'as some one has said,' or an incorrect attribution to

[1] The remarkably exact survival of proper names is to be explained as the result of the close organization of them, and the richness of association. Cf. William James, *The Principles of Psychology*, New York, 1890, Vol. I, p. 683.

some favourite, such as Schiller or Shakespeare. It is a matter of common observation that a joke is more acceptable if the author is unknown, that a song seems more like a song if the composer is not one of our immediate acquaintances. As for communal authorship of anything like ballad poetry, whether as the doctrine was originally stated or as it has been expounded of late, I have been unable to find much evidence. On the contrary, I find that among so primitive a race as the Melanesians, 'A poet or poetess more or less distinguished is probably found in every considerable village throughout the islands; when some remarkable event occurs, the launching of a canoe, a visit of strangers, or a feast, song-makers are engaged to celebrate it and rewarded, or the occasion produces a song, for which, in the Banks' Islands at any rate, a complimentary present is made[1].' Here we have individual authorship, and something corresponding to royalties. Among the Fijians, scarce fifty years out of cannibalism, the case is even more clear. We read of their characteristic type of song, the *Meke*, 'To only a few elect is it given to compose these; and those allege that they are carried away in their sleep to the spirit-world, where divine beings teach them a song with the appropriate dance[2].'

The problem of authorship, obscure enough when we are dealing with written records of celebrated individuals, is too difficult to be fairly treated in traditional poetry. When an epitaph by William Browne was for nearly three centuries attributed to Ben Jonson; when the authorship of the songs in Lyly's plays is in grave doubt; and when such a collection as the *Shakespeare Apocrypha* still flaunts the mystery of anonymity in the face of the literary historian, only a bold man would undertake to decide the authorship of such things as the ballads, and only a foolish man would ask for such an endeavour. In general, popular tradition tends to erase the individual author's name, just as it refuses to accept the expression of his feelings. A few popular heroes, as Thomas of Erceldoune in balladry and Abraham Lincoln in anecdote, have received credit for more than their own, because their names constitute the most interesting feature of many of the tales which have been told about them. But the public mind has been too much interested in Child Maurice and Sir Patrick Spens to care for the authors of the poems.

The metrical peculiarities of the ballads of Great Britain are few,

[1] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians: Studies in their Anthropology and Folk-Lore*, Oxford, 1891, p. 335.

[2] Friedrich Ratzel, *The History of Mankind*, London and New York, 1896, Vol. I, 2 21–2.

but highly significant. The stanza is almost invariably the conventional ballad stave, frequently with a refrain; and wrenched accents are very common. The more complicated verse-forms, which are incapable of the rhythmic effect which appeals to the simple mind, would soon have been lost[1]. The tune seems to have little value, in many cases, beyond that of serving to preserve the metrical form[2] and to facilitate oral expression.

It has been demonstrated by experiment that the mind tends to group metrical feet by fours or by threes[3], and that longer groups (as seven foot lines) tend to separate into two parts; and this is in accordance with actual observation everywhere. Not only is the ballad stave widely used in Northern Europe, but we find the Malayan *Sjiars* in much the same form. Material from all sources, once in the stream of popular transmission, tends to assume one of the accepted forms. When there is a variation from the normal stanza, it is usually in favour of an extra couplet, since this addition can be easily accommodated in the musical scheme by repeating the first half of the air. As the ballads are not sung to a fixed accompaniment, where exactly the same rhythms are required in each stanza, considerable variation is possible, as in two successive stanzas of 'Little Musgrave and Lady Barnard' (No. 81, F, st. 15, 16—in Professor Child's collection, as in all cases where ballads are cited by number):

'Lie still, my dear, lie still, my dear,
To keep me frae the cold;
For it is but my father's shepherds,
Driving their flocks to the fold.'

Up they lookit, and down they lay,
And they're fa'en sound asleep;
Till up stood good Lord Barnaby,
Just close at their bed-feet.

In many such cases this may be due to a desire for variety[4], in others to a desire for initial accent[5], and in others to the breaking of a monosyllable in Scots, so that what seems to us to be a truncated foot may be pronounced as an iambus. The normal foot in popular poetry is the

[1] Robert MacDougall, 'The Relation of Auditory Rhythm to Nervous Discharge,' *The Psychological Review*, Vol. IX, No. 5, p. 477.

[2] R. H. Stetson, 'Rhythm and Rhyme,' *The Psychological Review*, Monograph Supplements, Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 465.

[3] T. L. Bolton, 'Rhythm,' *The American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. VI, No. 2, pp. 216, 222, 236, and 170.

[4] J. E. W. Wallin, 'Experimental Studies of Rhythm and Time,' *The Psychological Review*, Vol. XVIII, p. 108.

[5] Bolton, *op. cit.*, pp. 160–2, 168, discusses the strong tendency to truncation and initial accent in the verse of children and savages.

iambus, though a strong case has been made for the trochee as a more natural measure[1]. The exact reason for this is hard to determine, but it is apparent that the iambic foot has been selected in practice. This can be tested to a certainty in the case of the English broadsides which have given rise to traditional ballads, where we see the original anapæstic feet and tumbling verse giving place to iambics, often with numerous syncopations and pauses. Compare the broadside version of 'Lord Thomas and Fair Annet' (No. 73, D) with the traditional version (A):

Lord Thomas he was a bold forrester,
And a chaser of the king's deer,

and

Lórd Thómas and Faír Annét
Sate á' day ón a híll.

The former is the original, and is perhaps a hundred years the older. A like simplification is evident in the versions of 'Earl Brand' (No. 7, B and A*). The former is largely from a penny pamphlet:

'Rise up, rise up now, Lord Douglas,' she says,
'And put on your armour so bright;
Let it never be said that a daughter of thine
Was married to a lord under night.'

The second is of undoubted traditional derivation, and exhibits a rhythm much simpler than that of the preceding:

She was na fifteen years o age
Till she came to the Earl's bed-side.

In another version of this, we have the rhythm of many passages of 'Mother Goose[2],' with the use of the exaggerated pause:

Ó ná! fý ná!
For I mét her fífteen míles awá.

It is apparent that verse could not come to this form without the aid of singing or of a chanting recitation.

For the use of pause within the line, 'Sir Patrick Spens' (No. 58, A) affords a notable example:

O whár will I gét ⌣ guíd sailór
To sail this schip of mine?

Bolton comments on the use of this sort of pause in Shakespeare, and the failure of the eighteenth century critics to understand it. At that very time the common people of Scotland were perpetuating this poem;

[1] Wallin, *op. cit.*, p. 115.
[2] For the use of pause and initial accent in nursery rhymes, cf. MacDougall and Bolton.

we must observe that the commoners seemingly had a better sense of rhythm than the critics of that period.

It is noteworthy that even the best of the Percy Manuscript ballads are more unmetrical than the traditional ballads of a century later. Two adjacent ballads in Professor Child's collection illustrate this uncommonly well. 'Musselburgh Field' (No. 172) exists only in a manuscript dating from about 1650, and 'Mary Hamilton' (No. 173, A) had been sung for more than two hundred years before it got into print. The first stanza of each will serve for comparison:

On the tenth day of December
And the fourth yeare of King Edwards raigne,
Att Musleboorrowe, as I remember,
Two goodly hosts there mett on a plaine,

and

Word's gane to the kitchen[1],
And word's gane to the ha,
That Marie Hamilton gangs wi bairn
To the hichest Stewart of a'.

The ballads of the Percy Manuscript are often hypermetrical[2], as they include many words which can be crowded into recitation with less difficulty than into singing. The simple ballads of oral transmission rarely have more syllables than the lines require, and often fewer, so that the syllables must be prolonged. When sung, these lines are very smooth; but without an allowance for the music they are often incapable of scansion. 'Lamkin' (No. 93, A) offers excellent examples of this, as in stanza 2:

'O pay – me – Lord – We – arie,
come, pay – me – my fee':
'I can – na pay – you, Lam – kin,
for I – maun gang – oer the sea.'

The preceding stanza is very difficult of scansion when read, but it falls naturally into the air of 'Auld Lang Syne.' The customary device of prolonging the vowels enables the singer to drop almost as many consonants as he chooses, and the song becomes the smoother for it. When we remember that the consonants are the significant features of written language[3], distinguishing the meanings of words with relatively little aid from the vowels, the importance of this licence becomes evident. As the consonants dropped out, the ballad ceased to narrate an intelligible story and became a song.

[1] Observe the initial accent, which gives the introduction its peculiar vigour of rhythm.
[2] As Nos. 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, and 177.
[3] Systems of shorthand have been based upon the consonants alone.

When the first stanza has been sung to the tune, a strong influence is set at work to shape the next stanza in a like fashion. '*The preceding verse affects the character of the following verse*[1].' 'The feeling of rhythm is more definite as we proceed in a verse, or a series of simple sound sensations. At first the cycle is not perfectly adjusted and complete automatism established[2],' but the simple musical setting necessitates a repetition, and the words must be shaped to fit the march of the tune. The ballad stave is a Procrustean bed in which all words must fit. Hence we have wrenched accents, such as *sailór*, *greetíng*, and *Howárd*[3]. We have much the same thing in modern songs, where the syllables are lengthened or shortened to fit the music:

There's – where – my heart – is turn – ing – ever,

or

And I would – that my tongue – could ut – ter.

Wrenched accents are not, as is often stated, primarily for the sake of rhyme; for they come most often in the unrhymed, or longer, lines. They are due, probably, not to the effort to secure rhyme, for that is done with monosyllables in the simple ballads, but to an attempt to satisfy the requirements of the four foot line, which is difficult for the ballad-singers to manage.

The reason for the predominance of rhythm in popular poetry is not far to seek. The rhythmic activity is itself a primitive one, which the higher brain processes tend to inhibit[4]. It requires repeated stimulus such as the ballad offers for its development, and it thrives best in a simple mind[5]. Furthermore, it requires for its enjoyment a sensory response. The mere auditory perception of sounds would produce no more than an abstract apprehension of varying intensities and intervals[6]. There must be a bodily response in the form of motor impulses, which are most easily aroused in the common people.

A notable example of the survival of rhythmic forms in oral transmission is the refrain. Professor Gummere has endeavoured to show a close relation between the refrain and an early choral dance; but it is not necessary for our purposes to go back from modern times, nor is it certain that we can do so with assurance. It has been established by

[1] Stetson, *op. cit.*, p. 460.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 455.
[3] This suggests the origin of Greek prose, through the inability of the historians to crowd proper names into metre.
[4] MacDougall, *op. cit.*, pp. 474–5.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 472–4.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 465.

experiment that periodic repetition is necessary to secure rhythm[1], and that what is logically a nonsense arrangement of words has more effectiveness for producing rhythm than the same words arranged in the usual order[2]. That is to say, the 'meaningless refrain' is the most significant factor in the rhythm of the stanza, and the lack of logical significance adds to its rhythmic value. For some reason which I have been unable to discover, the ballad burden is not used in a like manner in German ballad poetry[3]. Probably the desire for rhythmic repetition was satisfied by some other element in the German ballads. In any case, it is a blunder to suppose that the refrain is a mere accidental survival of a thing that had significance long ago. In the pitiless selective process of oral transmission, nothing survives which is not preferred for some functional value. To the simple mind, as to the child, 'Fie, foh, fum' is the most significant thing in the jingle. Furthermore, as MacDougall has pointed out, the recurrence of the refrain is a powerful aid to the continuity of the rhythmic sensation.

If we held to the theory that the refrain is a mere tag left by early choral dancers, a withered rose picked up on the ball-room floor of the primeval greenwood, we might suppose that the archaistic quality of the refrain is due to its being conventionalized. The stanza might then be expected to prove more variable, as the property of the individual singer. The refrain, as the common property of the crowd, and an heirloom from a distant past, should be more dependent on precedent, and should become stereotyped after a period of years, to remain unchanged until finally obscured by entire misconception. Unfortunately for communal theories, the refrain appears to be the most variable element of all; and new refrains continue to come into existence long after the dancing throng is forgotten. In recent years I have secured, from the Ozark Mountains of Missouri, an unpublished version of 'Sir Lionel' which shows an entirely new refrain, not to be explained as an archaic

[1] MacDougall, *op. cit.*, p. 479: 'Only in those pieces in which there is a return of the thought upon itself periodically in the form of a refrain, or the meaningless repetitions (meaningless from the point of view of associative thought, but most significant in their relation to the function of rhythm) of folk-songs and nursery rhymes, can the words of the verse be said to reinforce the rhythm in any way—that is, only when, at the sacrifice of their intrinsic significance, the words are used as practically pure sensory rhythm elements....One has a more distinct feeling of rhythm in the spoken verse of a tongue with which one is unfamiliar than in that of one's own speech.'

[2] R. C. Givler, *The Psycho-Physical Effect of the Elements of Speech in Relation to Poetry*, Doctor's Dissertation, Harvard, 1914, p. 637 f.

[3] W. P. Ker, 'On the History of the Ballads,' *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1909–1910, p. 181: 'The ballad burden which is universal in Danish and very common in English is not known or not used in the same way in German. More particularly, the English and Danish agree as against the German in their use of the inset burden.'

survival of anything else known to exist. The first stanzas will serve for illustration:

'There is a wild boar in that wood,
Ki – o – kee, ki – o – kum.
There is a wild boar in that wood,
He'll eat your flesh and he'll eat your blood.'

'How shall I that wild boar see[1]?
Ki – o – kee, ki – o – kum.
How shall I that wild boar see?'
'Blow your horn and he'll come to thee.'

The syllables of the refrain here may be due to a confusion of name or what not, but the reason for the retention of them is clearly to be found in their rhythmic appeal[2]. It will be noticed that the dialogue in this ballad is not very different from that of a version long known in England (No. 18, C), where we have such lines as

O what shall I do this wild boar to see?

But the refrain, 'Ki – o – kee, ki – o – kum,' is certainly unlike its English cousin,

Wind well thy horn, good hunter.

Indeed, we may fairly conclude that unless the refrain has a particular wealth of suggestion, or is intimately connected with the story, as

And we'll never gang down to the brume onie mair (No. 16, A),

it is more likely to change than any other part of the ballad[3]. There is also a marked tendency to use a popular refrain for different ballads, especially such vaguely suggestive and hauntingly melodious lines as

The broom blooms bonnie and so is it fair (No. 15, B)

or

With a hie downe downe a downe – a (No. 10, A).

[1] The fragment illustrates the tendency of popular poetry to revert to initial accent in the lines.

[2] Ratzel, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 33: 'Old forms of speech still in use, but long become unintelligible, are frequent in the unthinking life of the natural races. Thus a Fijian in battle, in challenging his opponent, shouts *Sai tave! Sai tave! kan ya mai ka yavia a bure*, that is, "Cut up! Cut up! the temple receives." But no man knows what the words mean, though they are held to be very ancient.' Codrington, *op. cit.*, p. 334: 'In the Banks' Islands the use of a distinct song-dialect is very remarkable, in which not only are words used which are never used in speech, some probably archaic and some borrowed from a neighbouring island, and not only are words contracted or prolonged to suit the tune, but in each island the song language is so different from that of ordinary speech that the two have the appearance of two dialects.'

[3] A typical example may be found in No. 20 (A, B, and C versions). All three of these versions are Scottish, and all were recovered from oral tradition within about the last sixty years. The story is almost identical, the rhymes are constant, the words are nearly alike, but the refrains are absolutely different.

A notable point has been made of the use of incremental repetition as a characteristic of popular ballads. Unfortunately, again, the facts seem to make little provision for the theory; for it is the simple ballads which most often have the fixed refrain[1], and the broadsides which exhibit the most marked use of incremental repetition[2]. Furthermore, when oral tradition adds a refrain to an original printed broadside, it is only a simple refrain, without the structural device of accretion which Professor Gummere considers so characteristic. 'The Sweet Trinity' (No. 286) was originally a broadside. Two hundred years later, the version developed by oral transmission (which was actually taken down by James Russell Lowell in 1884) had a new refrain, with the words 'Eck iddle du,' which I have been unable to trace to an earlier source. Are we to accredit the authorship of 'Eck iddle du' to the genius of communal origin in the dancing throngs of Cambridge in the nineteenth century?

When we come to consider rhyme, we find that one of its chief functions is to support the rhythm, and establish it in a certain definite form. It increases the natural pause at the end of each line[3], and it fixes the dynamic form of the two neighbouring unrhymed verses as well as of those which bear the rhyme[4]. That the rhymes in themselves can afford little pleasure is apparent from the frequency with which a single combination is employed. It is the value of rhyme as a binding element and as a support to the rhythm which causes it to survive[5], often after other elements are lost. In two versions of 'Erlinton' (No. 8, A* and B) the hero is Lord Erlinton in one and Tammas in the other, and the words of the stanzas vary considerably, but the rhymes are surprisingly constant. In two versions of 'Sir Patrick Spens' (No. 58, A and G), though the stories are widely divergent in their actual details and the stanzas occur in very different order, we find the rhymes unchanged wherever the difference of story permits. In the ten similar stanzas, with the sole exception of *command* for *sand*, and *be* for *see*, the rhymes are absolutely identical.

This tendency to survival of rhyme in the ballads is largely offset by

[1] Cf. Nos. 8, A*; 10, B; 11, A; and 11, B.
[2] Such as No. 9, A, by Deloney.
[3] Stetson, *op. cit.*, pp. 443, 447, 449.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 449.
[5] Bolton, *op. cit.*, p. 170: 'Final rhyme succeeded alliteration. The chief reason seems to have been for a more emphatic or distinguishing mark of the rhythm than could be obtained through accents alone; especially when run-on lines came to be used and the thought was about to usurp everything. When two successive sentences or words begin with the same sound, it interferes with the understanding of them. For this reason alliteration must give way, except for purposes of emphasis, when the thought becomes of the first importance.'

other influences. In the first place, the perfect rhymes which we have learned to expect from the printed page are not necessary for the ear alone, unless it is acutely trained. 'For the purposes of speech and song, we are accustomed to recognize as the same vowel anything within certain fairly wide limits[1].' Again, much of what appears in print to be bad rhyme is perfectly regular in the actual enunciation of illiterate people. *Man* rhymes with *hand*, if the final *d* of the latter is dropped in pronunciation. The late ballads show a great many bad rhymes, as between *m* and *n*, which are quite regular when explained as the result of careless speech. It is almost impossible for the educated to distinguish between these two consonants by ear, and many newspaper editors forbid reporters to trust to their judgment of *m* and *n* when receiving a name over the telephone. What could be expected of illiterate ballad-singers in this regard? In the third place, much of the assonance in ballads is due to the process of singing, in which the vowels alone are fully stressed, and 'Many of the consonants are the clicks or checks which occur at the beginning of musical tone[2].' In addition to the forgetfulness of singers, and their inability to make exact rhymes, there is this physiological hindrance to the perpetuation of exact rhymes in the ballads: 'In singing, especially at higher pitches, conditions are less favourable for the characterization of vowels. Every one knows that it is more difficult to understand words when sung than when spoken....Were it otherwise, "books of the words" at operas and concerts would be unnecessary[3].'

In objection to this, it may be urged that ballads are not sung with the smooth and sustained tone employed by the concert or operatic singer, and consequently the enunciation is more distinct. For 'when any vowel is powerfully commenced, its characteristic tone becomes audible as a short beat. By this means the vowel may be distinctly characterized at the moment of commencement, even when it becomes intermediate on long continuance....For this reason also the vocalization of the briefly-uttered words of a reciting *parlando* is more distinct than that of sustained song[4].'

As a fourth reason for the loss of rhyme, it might be urged that the pattern of the music tends to displace the pattern of the verse. For instance, the concert version of Ben Jonson's 'To Celia' invariably spoils

[1] Edwin H. Barton, *A Text-Book on Sound*, London, 1908, p. 460.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 459.
[3] H. L. von Helmholtz, *On the Sensations of Tone as a Physiological Basis for the Theory of Music* (tr. and rev. by A. J. Ellis), London and New York, 1895, p. 114.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

one of the rhymes by substituting *sip* for *sup*. But in the case of the ballads, the tune has so little pattern that it scarcely serves to conceal the rhyme of the poem.

There are really four kinds of defective rhyme in the ballads: repetition of the rhyme word; vowel-rhyme; consonant-rhyme (alliteration of both initial and final consonants); and dissimilarity of both vowels and consonants. It is a common supposition that assonance in the ballads is a mark of antiquity, since it was a regular device in poems of an early time. Why, then, is it the *latest* ballads that show the most imperfect rhymes? One version of 'The Duke of Athole's Nurse' (No. 212, B) has only one pair of perfect rhymes, used three times, and another version (A) has only the same pair, twice repeated. Evidently these two rhyme words have been remembered, and the other lines have been filled out at a hazard. In short, it is fair to suppose that although assonance *may* have been a device which was employed by the authors of the ballads, imperfect rhymes would, in any case, naturally result from the influences which are due to the nature of oral transmission.

The narrative technique of the ballad has received much attention in recent years; it is sufficient for present purposes to state the now universal conclusion that the best ballads are unified works of art. What relation does oral transmission bear to this artistic quality of the ballads? Professor Gummere has decided this for us by a single Gordian stroke: 'The ballad is a conglomerate of choral, dramatic, lyric, and epic elements which are due now to suggestive refrain, now to improvisation, now to individual invention, and are forced into a more or less poetic unity by the pressure of tradition in long stretches of time[1].' He cites as a perfect example of this conglomerate product 'Mary Hamilton,' saying, 'We could not part more appropriately from the genuine ballad of tradition, still undeveloped into epic breadth, than with this fine version on our lips[2].' I find it difficult to see how the term *conglomerate* can be applied to such a unified and artistic whole as 'Mary Hamilton'; and as for 'the pressure of tradition,' we have seen how, so far from improving or even preserving the ballad under unusually favourable circumstances, it left but a single stanza of lyric lament. No 'bad mouths' were involved, and the ballad passed from generation to generation of people who loved it. After a painstaking study of the subject, I have yet to find a clear case where a ballad can be shown to have improved as a result of oral transmission, except in the way of becoming more lyrical.

[1] F. B. Gummere, *The Popular Ballad*, Boston, 1907, p. 321. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

As far as the narrative element is concerned, tradition works nothing but corruption in the ballad, usually in one or more of the following ways: (1) the ballad loses its central action and the explanatory passages, and becomes a fragment dealing with a situation[1]; (2) the gaps thus left are sometimes supplied by borrowings from other ballads, or, less frequently, by a new improvisation; (3) by this new improvisation in part, and in all cases by errors of interpretation and the grossness of selection, the original becomes vulgarized; and (4) in the last stage of its oral currency, when it falls sufficiently out of general use to be relegated to the nursery, it becomes a song for children.

Explanatory matter is lost first, and the material which deals with *pure situation* is retained longest. The explanation of the wolf's appearance in 'Young Andrew' (No. 48), entirely essential to the latter part of the story, is gone, but the general situation remains. The mender of ballads most often betrays his hand at this point; he feels that explanatory matter is needed, or finds this a convenient excuse for making additions. When the mender is a poet of the ability of Walter Scott, we find learned gentlemen more than a century later still debating as to whether he actually did it; when he is a poor blind drudge, as illiterate as Buchan's 'wight,' his interpolations can usually be ferreted out in the course of half a century. Much of the leaping narration of the ballads, and conceivably most of it, may be explained as a result of the omission of narrative detail. Attribution of speeches, in particular, is likely to be lost; for it is unnecessary in any poetry which is sung or spoken with any degree of mimetic skill, as we must suppose the ballads have always been. The omission of the speaker's name is in no way peculiar to the ballads; if Shakespeare's plays were to be taken down from oral transmission on the stage, the lack of attribution of speeches would be even more uniform.

It should be remembered that the longer versions of the ballads are as much recitations as songs. Wherever they have become pure songs, as in certain parts of Scotland, and in nurseries everywhere, they have been shortened, lessened in narrative scope, and made more lyrical in feeling and external form. Motherwell's collection bears eloquent testimony to this tendency. When the story itself is based on a subject of universal appeal, where emotion is supreme and homely phraseology is no hindrance, transmission may serve to better the poem. Mother-love offers a pre-eminent opportunity for this, as in 'The Wife of Usher's

[1] Cf. my 'Omission of the Central Action in English Ballads,' *Modern Philology*, Vol. XI, No. 3.

Well' (No. 79). But at best this tendency will destroy the whole poem eventually, if allowed to work unhampered. 'The Lass of Roch Royal' (No. 76) was sung widely among the people of Galloway and Dumfriesshire until it was reduced to a single stanza, charged with lyrical feeling, but quite unintelligible by itself (version K):

> O open the door, Love Gregory,
> O open, and let me in;
> The wind blows through my yellow hair,
> And the dew draps oer my chin.

When a ballad has become fragmentary, it is interesting to observe what features linger in the public mind: some fine lament, or a stirring speech, a 'good night'; some situation fraught with pathos; some mention of mermaids, golden combs, or other materials of folk-lore; or some conventional stanza, perhaps not part of the original poem but worked in from the common fund to fill a gap. In nearly all cases, the last surviving fragment satisfies one of these conditions: it is moving, strange, or conventional.

The conventionality of the ballad is so apparent that some have attempted to trace out ballad origins by the study of analogues. Unless we can prove that all prose fiction based on 'the eternal triangle' has sprung from the same source, why should we attempt a similar feat in the case of the ballads? It is doubtful if they show a greater similarity of plot than is found in an equal section of any other form of literature. The differences have been levelled more, and creative ability to adapt and reconstruct has been more lacking—can we be sure of anything further?

However few the ballad stories may be, they are more numerous than the ways of telling them. Not only do we find a common stock of stereotyped words, but whole stanzas are used interchangeably. 'Tam Lin' (No. 39, A) and 'Hind Etin' (No. 41, B), which are, in spite of similarities, quite independent of each other, show such remarkable resemblances as this:

> She had na pu'd a double rose,
> A rose but only twa,
> Till up then started young Tam Lin,
> Says, Lady, thou's pu nae mae.

> She had na pu'd a nut, a nut,
> A nut but barely ane,
> Till up started the Hynde Etin,
> Says, Lady, let thae alane!

Conventional stanzas owe their currency, presumably, rather to the effects of oral transmission than to any common origin; for they creep

in more persistently in the later versions of the ballads, in the oldest text of which they were unknown. In their own original setting they were appropriate, but they are usually out of place in the later imitations. Such fine originals as 'Mary Hamilton' and 'Sir Patrick Spens' have furnished forth nearly a score of ballads of a later day, such as No. 99, F (from recitation, 1825):

Word has to the kitchen gane,
And word has to the ha,
And word has to the king himsell,
In the chamber where he sat,
That his ae daughter goes wi bairn
To bonnie Johnie Scot

and No. 99, C (Buchan MSS, c. 1828):

When Brown Adam he read these lines,
A light laugh then gae hee.

In 'The Knight and the Shepherd's Daughter' (No. 110, B, Kinloch MSS, 1826 and after) occur the same inappropriate stanzas which disfigure the later versions of 'Child Waters' (No. 63), in which the lady boasts that she can swim like an eel or otter. Another version of the former (No. 110, G), which is from late recitation, begins with the wholly misplaced lines from the rag bag of conventional stanzas,

Jo Janet has to the greenwood gane,
Wi a' her maidens free.

Perhaps the most objectionable of these borrowed stanzas are those which have been added with a desire of heightening the climax, of putting on the finishing touches. A characteristic stanza of the sort is the one which tells of the death or insanity of the chief characters. In 'Lord Ingram and Chiel Wyet' (No. 66, B) it is

There was nae mean made for that godd lords,
In bower whar they lay slain,
But a' was for that lady,
In bowr whar she gaed brain.

Almost identical stanzas occur at the end of 'Willie and Lady Maisry' (No. 70, B) and 'Glasgerion' (No. 67, B). A similar addition, under circumstances which make the event incredible, appears in 'Little Musgrave and Lady Barnard' (No. 81, E). This tendency in the ballads of oral transmission to spoil the climax seems to be due to a lack of dramatic sense. Instead of powerful climaxes which the earlier versions secure, the later versions substitute childish punishments for crime, as

in 'Lamkin' (No. 93, D), or add a note entirely foreign to the ballad, as in 'The Cruel Brother' (No. 11, B):

> Now does she neither sigh nor groan:
> She lies aneath yon marble stone.

The A version of the same ballad works up to a good climax with the line,

> The wilderness to end her life.

But the singer shows a total lack of appreciation when he adds,

> This ladie fair in her grave was laid,
> And many a mass was oer her said.
>
> But it would grieve your heart right sair,
> To see the bridegroom rive his hair.

The final stanza of 'The Wife of Usher's Well' (No. 79) is finely rendered in both of the earlier versions; but in North Carolina it has been replaced by another which contradicts the usual ballad postulate that tears for the dead interfere with their rest:

> Green grass grows at our head, dear mother,
> Green grass grows at our feet;
> The tears that you shed for us three babes
> Won't wet our winding sheet.

It is almost universally true that the most effective of the ballads, and often those which exhibit the most conspicuous characteristics of what is commonly called genuine traditional poetry, are those which have least claim to oral transmission. The best version of 'Edward' (No. 13, B) was transmitted to Percy by Lord Hailes. We have no certain knowledge that it was ever sung by the common people, or even known by them in that form; and so eminent an authority on the Scottish vernacular as Mr Henderson states that this version is in the language of the upper classes of Scotland in the seventeenth century[1]. The undoubtedly popular version (A) is lame throughout: the mother's guilt is entirely absent, and the son condemns her to the fire with no apparent reason.

The principle of unconscious selection by the group accomplishes many of the purposes of conscious art, especially the adaptation of subject to audience; but it is much less likely to add a new beauty to the original. It is hard for popular poetry to rise above the understanding of the dullest person who serves as a link in the chain of transmission. In a way, the ballad resembles the proverb: there is

[1] T. F. Henderson, *The Ballad in Literature*, Cambridge, 1912.

nothing left in it which is not acceptable to all who preserve it by repetition. The simple ballads, which have served a general public, are non-technical in diction, whereas the modern songs of special classes, as of cowboys and engineers, are highly technical. The same levelling process destroys whatever individual character the original poem may have. A similar selection is shown in the choice of subject matter. It has been held that the true ballad can never be obscene, because it cannot fall below the level of popular taste. This is, no doubt, partly true of European countries in modern times; but we must not overlook the inordinate fondness for stories of sexual relations which is so evident in the simple ballads. The lack of humour in the best ballads would inhibit the use of the most common sorts of obscenity; but if the ballad has been long enough in transmission, there are likely to appear evidences of the love of sensual suggestion so common in primitive poetry, in which interpolations are commonly used 'to bring in some quite irrelevant bit of coarseness which for the general public constitutes the main attraction of the poem[1].'

Such phrases as *the wily parrot*, *milk-white steeds*, and *lily-white hands*, and the numbers three and seven are considered peculiar to the cabalistic lore of the ballads. Why, then, are details of this sort relatively lacking in the earlier versions, but more and more conspicuous as the ballad is transmitted? The use of conventional padding of all kinds is also a progressive development, considered chronologically. Near the middle of the eighteenth century Herd secured a version of 'Fair Janet' (No. 64, C) which is stated in rather good narrative fashion, though the central action has already been lost. We have here *up then spake* twice. In the B version, from Motherwell's Manuscript about sixty years later, we have *ben and cam* three times, and *out and spoke* twice. But in a still later version (E) from the recitation of Mary Barr, we have *up and raise* and *out and spake* in monotonous iteration. The later versions of the ballads are the beggar children of poetry, each dressed in the cast-off finery of a dozen of its superiors.

A similar use of set forms leads to a sort of incremental repetition in the later ballads, which in no way conflicts with our previous statement that true incremental repetition is more common in the broadsides than in the simple ballads. In 'The Knight and the Shepherd's Daughter' (No. 110, E) we find fifty lines of offers, refusals, and swearings before the girl is attacked. A colloquial sense of humour, totally foreign to the original spirit of the poems, mars many of the later versions. The

[1] Ratzel, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 222.

climax of 'Lady Alice' (No. 85, C) is spoiled entirely by the stanza just preceding, which tells of the fatal sickness of the heroine in such terms as this:

Her mother she made her some plum-gruel,
With spices all of the best;
Lady Alice she ate but one spoonful,
And the doctor he ate up the rest.

The earlier ballads, after allowances have been made for their peculiarities, are rather logical as a whole; but the later ballads show an utter disregard for significance. It is a common habit of critics to blame Buchan's wight for all the corruptions in his versions; and indeed no more perfect example of the degradation of ballad style can be desired than his 'Brown Adam' (98, C), where the smith stops to give corn and hay to his horse while the intruding knight is parleying with his wife. But what shall we say when we find even greater incongruities in oral tradition which is unimpeached? 'Lady Maisry' (No. 65, D) is quite equal to Buchan's worst (stanzas 20–21):

He laid ae arm about her neck,
And the other beneath her chin;
He thought to get a kiss o her,
But her middle it gade in twain.

'But who has been so false,' he said,
'And who has been so cruel,
To carry the timber from my ain wood
To burn my dearest jewel?'

The later versions show clearly the marks of many mouths, speaking different dialects and idioms. 'The Trooper Lad' (No. 299) is not inconsistent in tone as it appears in the versions of the early nineteenth century, but by 1895 it has dropped into such confusion of styles as this (stanzas 2 and 4):

The bonny lass being in the close,
The moon was shining clearly,—
'Ye'r welcome here, my trooper lad,
Ye'r welcome, my kind deary.'

She's ta'en the knight by the milk-white hand,
And led him to her chamber,
And gied him bread and cheese to eat,
And wine to drink his pleasure.

Even this is improved on in the version of 1896, taken from singing. When the dissolute trooper is departing from the girl, instead of answering her flippantly, as in the older versions, he becomes a Puritan for the nonce:

'When will we twa meet again?
When will we meet and marry?'
'When peace and truth come to this land,
Nae langer, love, we'll tarry.'

It is interesting to observe the changes which the ballads undergo in America, removed from the setting which gave them being. In North Carolina[1] the terrible mason Lamkin becomes John Lankin; instead of entering at the shot-window (A version) he comes through the kitchen window; instead of being boiled in lead (D) or hanged (B, F, I) he is hung, and not at the gate (B) but on the gallows. Certain tags remain, in token of the old time: it is still a castle which Lamkin built, and there is a 'dank moat' around it. Contradictions arise from the narrator's effort to explain his material. He thinks the lord should have guarded his castle, and so he tells us (stanza 3):

He did guard his castle
With soldiers every hour.

But when John Lankin enters, we hear no more of the soldiers.

When the time came, in any community, when the adults no longer cared to hear the ballads, the process of transmission was restricted to the nursery. The heroes were dwarfed to suit the imagination of little boys, as in the nursery versions of 'Lord Randall' (No. 12, J), 'Sir Hugh' (No. 155, P and R), and several of the later versions of 'Lamkin' (No. 93). In 'The Twa Brothers' (No. 49, B) this is particularly evident, for two nursery stanzas appear which are quite out of keeping with the rest of the tragic poem. When this nursery transmission, together with the other influences which we have mentioned as injurious to the ballad, is allowed to work its will upon the poem, without hindrance from intelligent adults, the result is sometimes an almost incredible jargon. 'Lamkin' (No. 93, T) was taken down before 1867 from an old woman near Killarney, with the climax in such shape as this (stanzas 16–19):

'O mama, dear mama,
then please him awhile;
My dada is coming,
he's dressed in great style.'

False Lantin he heard
the words from the high,
Saying, Your mama is dead,
and away I will fly.

'O dada, dear dada,
do not blame me,
'Tis nurse and false Lantin
betrayed your ladie.'

'I'll bury my mama
against the wall,
And I'll bury my baba,
white all, white all.'

[1] Child, *op. cit.*, Vol. x, Additions and Corrections, p. 295.

The objection is raised that these principles apply only to the decadent period of balladry; to study the ballad aright, say the critics, you must go back to its fountain source in the golden age of choral dancing. This argument is worthy of the genial author of *Water Babies*: how can we prove anything by ballads which do not exist? All the ballads we have, or know to have existed, or can with any satisfactory reason suppose to have existed, belong to the same ubiquitous and eternal decadent period. The ballad, once in the toboggan of oral transmission, is always going down hill. We may find it near the bottom of the slide, or a short distance up the slope; what if we should come upon it at the top of the hill?

Some years ago, as an idle experiment, I walked into a wood near a college town and fastened a sheet of verse to a tree. Within a week the stanzas were published, and a little later they had been twice republished and had been claimed by a man two hundred miles away. In vain I endeavoured to recover them: the original manuscript still remained, in my handwriting and in my most individual style; but anonymity had claimed them as her own. It was conceded that somebody had written the stanzas; but that was a mysterious somebody, not to be identified with an ordinary individual. And this happened in the twentieth century, under the shadow of a university which was just establishing the first school of journalism in the world. A few hundred years ago, before the age of royalties and away from the haunts of the literary lions, Burns would have made the poem of Tam Lin and Scott would have sung of Otterburn.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE.

MADISON, WIS., U.S.A.

'LE GRAND ALCANDRE FRUSTRÉ' AND 'LA PRINCESSE DE CLÈVES'[1].

BESIDE the works of French classicism which show Louis XIV and his court in all the insignia of royalty, there existed another literature in which the undying *esprit gaulois* manifests itself plainly. This literature, if so it may be called, took the form of satiric pamphlets, usually anonymous and now forgotten. Some attack the political policy of the great king; some satirize his or his courtiers' private life. My purpose is to study one example of this contraband type, an example peculiarly interesting from its double origin.

Le Grand Alcandre Frustré ou les Derniers Efforts de l'Amour et de la Vertu[2] appeared in 1696. It was attributed by contemporaries to Gatien de Courtilz, who was held responsible for various political pamphlets as well as for others with such titles as *Les Conquêtes Amoureuses du Grand Alcandre dans les Pays-Bas*, and *Les Dames dans leur Naturel ou la Galanterie sans façon sous le règne du Grand Alcandre*[3]. Perhaps the resemblance between these titles and that of the *Grand Alcandre Frustré* led contemporaries to assign the latter to Courtilz[4]. Some modern authorities, such as Barbier, share their opinion. I shall attempt to indicate the relation between pamphlets of the type mentioned and the *Grand Alcandre Frustré*, and to discuss the question of authorship.

[1] The writer wishes especially to thank Professor Casis at whose suggestion this little study was drawn from a monograph on Courtilz.

[2] First published in 1696. The Arsenal Library at Paris possesses a copy of this first edition which bears the name of a fictitious publisher: *A Cologne, chez Pierre Marteau.* This was reprinted by Paul Lacroix in 1874. Barbier (*Dict. des Anon.*) cites editions of 1709 and 1731; Leber (*Cat. des Livres*), another published at Montauban in 1717; the Arsenal Library possesses an edition published at Montauban in 1719 which shows slight variants from the first edition. This 1719 edition is reprinted by Livet in the fourth volume of *L'Histoire Amoureuse des Gaules*, edited by Boiteau in 1876.

[3] The first appeared in 1684, the second in 1686. The Grand Alcandre is of course Louis XIV and the Pays Bas Versailles.

[4] These pamphlets, as well as *Le Grand Alcandre Frustré*, are attributed to Courtilz on the authority of Bayle. See his *Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial*, T. I, p. 241. Bayle does not speak positively.

The unedifying lives of king, nobles and court-ladies are exposed and ridiculed in these libels. They belong to a class which became popular with the publication of Bussy Rabutin's *Histoire Amoureuse des Gaules*[1]. It should be added that this unworthy progeny lacks entirely the delicacy of style of its brilliant and acrid original. But such a defect mattered little, as the scribbling authors wrote for the populace and compensated for their lack of style by the scurrility of their anecdotes. They often show no little vivacity in narrating burlesque incidents too coarse to be even hinted at here. It may be noted in passing that the preface of *Les Dames dans leur Naturel* states that the book is printed from an old manuscript recently discovered. Such assertions precede nearly all the works attributed to Courtilz, and were a common subterfuge of scandalmongers.

The *Grand Alcandre Frustré* assuredly owes something to these pamphlets, especially its constant effort to cast ridicule on the great king—of petticoats, and to show him baffled by a woman. But it is more interesting as an imitation of the masterpiece of seventeenth century fiction—Mme de La Fayette's *Princesse de Clèves*[2]. This novel is too well known to need any summary. One essential scene—that of the avowal of the passion of M. de Nemours, which Mme de Clèves makes to her husband at Colomiers—should, however, be mentioned. It was sharply criticized by some contemporaries who failed to understand the character of the heroine[3]. But this scene, like every incident in the life of the princess, has been carefully prepared by her education and by the perfect frankness of her relations with her husband. She feels herself that he is perhaps the only man at court to whom a wife could make such a confidence, and the careful reader must share her view. It will appear shortly what the author of the *Grand Alcandre Frustré*[4] thought of this scene.

This latter work is preceded by a preface, signed by the bookseller, which deserves attention. First of all it makes a claim, not unfounded, to a certain originality; it further informs us that the

[1] First published in 1665.

[2] First published in 1678.

[3] Bussy Rabutin among others. For contemporary criticism, see M. d'Haussonville, *Madame de La Fayette*, p. 204, Paris, 1901, in 16mo.

[4] The name *Alcandre* was applied to Henry IV by Malherbe in 1629. The king, under this name, is made to address one of his mistresses. It is again applied to him in a pamphlet resembling those already mentioned and entitled: *Les Amours du Grand Alcandre**, published in 1665 at Cologne chez Pierre de Marteau, according to the title page. In the works attributed to Courtilz, it is applied to Louis XIV. The word is a Greek formation, meaning mighty man.

* For this work see Jaumart de Brouillant, *Histoire de Pierre de Marteau*, Paris, 1888.

manuscript was found at Paris among the papers left at death by a nobleman[1], and is printed without change. More interesting is the following paragraph which points at once to the source of inspiration: 'Cette illustre comtesse...se défend avec une vertu tout-à-fait héroïque, se tire adroitement de tous les pièges que l'amour lui tend, et, en étouffant une passion criminelle, elle gagne l'estime et l'admiration de celui qui la voulut déshonorer. Il est bien juste qu'après qu'on a exposé aux yeux du public les fautes de celles qui ont fait honte à leur sexe, on lui fasse part de la vertu de cette héroine qui en relève l'honneur et que nous pouvons mettre au nombre des femmes fortes, puisqu'elle a triomphé de tout ce que l'amour a de plus tendre, de plus fort et de plus engageant.' This countess will be then a second Princesse de Clèves, but her history is written by one as well read in the scurrilous pamphlets as in the older, so-called idealistic, novels. The author is evidently trying to surpass the achievement of Mme de La Fayette by mingling the originality of her work with the spirit of the libels.

The story told in this little novel is as follows: The king, till then so redoubtable in love, has long cherished for a beautiful lady of his court a passion which he durst not openly avow. His love not being returned, he seeks the aid of the duc de La Feuillade, a past-master of amorous intrigue. This wily courtier, after vainly exhorting the king to speak for himself, undertakes to smooth the way, but the countess will not listen and even threatens to inform her husband of the insulting proposals. At this point, as at several others, the author offers a criticism of *La Princesse de Clèves*: 'La comtesse...se garda bien de faire ce qu'elle avait dit, et d'imiter la princesse de Clèves dans une conjoncture si délicate,' etc. And again later: 'Elle crut donc qu'elle ne devrait plus dissimuler à son mari la passion que le Grand Alcandre avait pour elle...mais elle se garda bien de lui dire les mauvais pas où elle s'était trouvée avec le roi. Car quoiqu'elle en fût sortie à son honneur, ces sortes de choses ne sont pas bonnes à dire à un mari qui en pourrait tirer des conséquences fâcheuses.'

The scene changes to Fontainebleau and the king, learning that the

[1] This cannot be taken more seriously than the similar statements always found in such works. The edition of 1719 states that the nobleman referred to was the duc de La Feuillade. Probably this is based on the rôle played by the duke in the story. Paul Lacroix (*op. cit.*) believes the original of the heroine, who is called the comtesse de L**, to be *la Belle de Lude* (*Marie Isabelle*): Livet (*op. cit.*), after extensive research, decides in favour of Mme de Soubise, wife of François de Rohan. She was born in 1648 and married in 1663. The action of the story takes place in 1672. One may perhaps venture to suggest that this virtuous woman at the Grand Alcandre's court existed solely in the author's imagination.

countess often walks without attendants in the forest, meets her and obtains permission to plead his love. She grants his petition lest he may suspect her of weakening and hope still more from a refusal. This *motif* recurs several times and seems to be a criticism of the Princess of Clèves who avoids her lover. Here is a typical example: 'Elle (la princesse) exécuta enfin la résolution qu'elle avait prise de sortir de chez son mari, lorsqu'il (le duc de Nemours) y serait: ce fut toutefois en se faisant une extrême violence. Ce prince vit bien qu'elle le fuyait, et en fut sensiblement touché.'

The countess is by no means indifferent to Alcandre's admiration, and he, perceiving it, arranges a hunting party at Fontainebleau. Here, thanks to the connivance of La Feuillade, he meets her alone in a secluded valley. He draws from her an avowal of her love, but at the moment when he believes every obstacle conquered, she escapes him, seizes his sword and is on the point of taking her own life. The king promises to annoy her no more, and they rejoin the hunting party. The excitement of the day makes them both ill, and the king's solicitude for the countess arouses the suspicion of Mme de Montespan, who vainly tries to blacken her in the eyes of Alcandre. Finding no other means of attaining his end, the king resolves to bribe the servants of the countess and thus gain access to her; but a burlesque accident overthrows his project, and the adventure ends in his discomfiture.

The court returns to Versailles, where a great festival is to take place—a triumphal procession of love and intrigue varied by masked balls and the like. Both the king and Mme de Montespan inform themselves of the domino to be worn by the countess; the favourite, who has resolved to ruin her rival's reputation, chooses the same mask, meets the king, and, after some formal resistance, shows herself less obdurate than the lady she impersonates. But on this occasion the Grand Alcandre proves unworthy of his name and retreats abashed. The following day, when he meets the real countess unmasked, he attributes her reserve to natural modesty. A new ball brings the same actors together again. Mme de Montespan causes warning to be sent to M. de L** to watch his wife, as she had been seen in suspicious company. Then, disguised as before, she returns to the place of meeting where the king awaits her. He is completely deceived as to her identity, and finds in her unsuspected charms—which goes to prove, says the author, that the keenest pleasures are those of the imagination. Alarmed by the sound of approaching footsteps the false countess retires hastily. The king is astonished to see Mme de L**

with her husband, and to learn that they have been together all the evening. Both ask news of another domino, whose costume is exactly like that of the countess, and Alcandre, dumbfounded, is at a loss to answer. Recognizing at last the vanity of his hope, he renounces it for ever.

Such, reduced to its simplest form, is the action of the novelette. It must be admitted that in its bare outline it resembles an expanded incident of the libellous pamphlets. More than one of its situations belong to the burlesque repertory. The unfailing *parti pris* of ridiculing the king is found in both the novel and the pamphlets. But the latter are only jumbles of scurrilous anecdotes written to amuse the populace, and attempt neither to paint background nor to delineate character. The plot of the *Grand Alcandre Frustré* develops naturally, and the psychological analysis is more interesting than the incidents related. Moreover the author appreciates the value of landscape in itself as having a formative influence on the actions and sentiments of the characters. He is at no little pains to vary the scene, taking the reader now to the solitudes of the forest of Fontainebleau, now to the grottos of the park at Versailles to present him to a masked ball. The women of the pamphlets are those of the old French *fabliaux*; their one instinct is to deceive their husbands or lovers more or less resourcefully. The character of the countess is traced with a subtlety and a knowledge of feminine psychology of which the *Princesse de Clèves* gave the first idea. Though the author cannot attain the same exquisite delicacy he recalls, in happier moments, his delightful model.

On the other hand the plot retains the rapid movement of the pamphlets. Its main personages are three—the woman, the lover and the go-between—and they are presented only at the moment of action. The care taken by Mme de La Fayette to describe the education of her heroine, her pains to let the reader follow the development of her character, before and after her marriage, her efforts to gain sympathy for the husband—and finally the noble idealism which makes the princess remain loyal to the memory of her husband—all this and more is above and beyond the author of the *Grand Alcandre Frustré*. His aim is rather to amaze his reader by such virtue in a woman than to explain it. The husband hardly appears at all. The main purpose of the book, as has been said, is to ridicule the king by exhibiting him placed in a ludicrous plight by a woman; and delicacy is too often sacrificed to this end. But, the situation once accepted, we must admit that the scenes follow one another logically enough.

Let us now turn to the character of the countess. As soon as she becomes aware of the monarch's interest in her, she blushes under his impassioned gaze, but he finds no encouragement in that: 'Il voyait... qu'elle [sa rougeur] était d'une autre espèce que celle que l'amour peint lui-même dans un cœur enflammé, à l'approche de l'objet qu'il aime. Il voyait à travers ce voile éclatant, toutes les marques de la pudeur, de la sagesse, de la modestie, et de la chasteté; mais il y remarquait aussi la secrète indignation d'une vertu offensée, qui se voyait attaquée par des regards criminels.'

There is to be noted here a suggestion of preciosity which occurs frequently in the book and links it to the older novels. After her interview with La Feuillade, in which she had been at no loss to answer, the countess is in doubt as to whether she should rejoice or mourn. Like every woman she is not insensible to the homage of a king, yet she is scared by the publicity of royal amours. 'Comme elle était fort délicate du côté de l'honneur et de la réputation, ces dernières pensées la troublaient beaucoup.' She determines to make no change in her mode of life, neither seeking nor avoiding the king. But at their meeting in the forest of Fontainebleau, she is strangely excited. He perceives her emotion and addresses her in accents of frenzied passion. She controls herself sufficiently to answer with dignity and firmness, declaring that her life is at the disposition of her sovereign, but that her honour is her own. When, at last, he has wrung from her permission to plead his cause, the author comments: 'C'est une maxime certaine en fait d'amour, que les femmes vont toujours plus loin qu'elles ne pensent, et les hommes, au contraire, se flattent d'avoir fait plus de chemin qu'ils n'en ont fait en effet...Ils reconnurent bientôt l'un et l'autre qu'ils s'étaient trompés, lui de croire qu'on le regardait favorablement, elle de s'imaginer qu'elle avait soutenu jusqu'au bout sa première sévérité.' In spite of herself she loves him, and is happy to know herself loved. 'Elle trouvait qu'il faisait tout en roi, et ce dernier caractère était le plus propre pour gagner une dame qui était fière naturellement.' She fears the mastery of her own emotions, and vainly seeks in her lover for some flaw worthy of detestation. At whiles she is on the point of yielding: 'Pourquoi se contraindre, disait-elle en elle-même: suivons un penchant si doux: serai-je la seule ennemie de mon contentement? Je suis adorée de ce que j'aime: j'ai un mari commode, ma réputation est si bien établie que je n'ai rien à craindre de la médisance: pourquoi donc ne pas suivre une passion qui a tant de charmes pour moi? Mais un moment après

elle se reprenait, et faisant réflexion sur les suites funestes de ce fatal engagement, "Je serai, disait-elle, une des maîtresses du roi? J'en suis aimée, j'en suis estimée aujourd'hui, et demain je serai méprisée. Il se dégoûtera de moi comme il a fait des autres, et quand cela ne serait pas, pourrai-je me résoudre à vivre sans honneur dans le monde, abandonnée de mon mari, méprisée de tous les honnêtes gens, et travaillée d'un cruel remords qui me dévorera jour et nuit? Je mourrai plutôt avant que de tomber dans ce malheur."'

It is interesting to compare the last two citations with the reflexions of the Princess of Clèves. The difference in the moral tone of the two books is sufficiently indicated by the remark that the Princess is a widow and is debating the question of marriage with M. de Nemours. 'Ce prince se présenta à son esprit, aimable au-dessus de tout ce qui était au monde, l'aimant depuis longtemps avec une passion pleine de respect et de fidélité, méprisant tout pour elle, respectant jusqu'à sa douleur...Plus de devoir, plus de vertu, qui s'opposassent à ses sentiments: tous les obstacles étaient levés, et il ne restait de leur état passé que la passion de M. de Nemours pour elle et que celle qu'elle avait pour lui.' And later, speaking to M. de Nemours himself: 'Je sais que vous êtes libre, que je le suis, et que les choses sont d'une sorte que le public n'aurait peut-être pas sujet de vous blâmer ni moi non plus, quand nous nous engagerions ensemble pour jamais: mais les hommes conservent-ils de la passion dans ces engagements éternels? Dois-je espérer un miracle en ma faveur, et puis-je me mettre en état de voir certainement finir cette passion dont je ferais toute ma félicité? Je vous croirais toujours amoureux et aimé, et je ne me tromperais pas souvent...Quand je pourrais m'accoutumer à cette sorte de malheur, pourrais-je m'accoutumer à celui de croire voir toujours M. de Clèves vous accuser de sa mort, me reprocher de vous avoir aimé, de vous avoir épousé, et me faire sentir la différence de son attachement au vôtre?... Il est vrai que je sacrifie beaucoup à un devoir qui ne subsiste que dans mon imagination.'

In a different style are the remarks of La Feuillade after the king's attempt to surprise the countess by entering her apartments disguised as her husband. In its cold and cynical logic his commentary would do credit to a Bussy Rabutin or to one of Stendhal's heroes: 'Savez-vous que la main d'un amant qui manie le corps de sa maîtresse a un certain charme secret qui réveille en elle de certaines idées dont elle ne peut se défendre? Qu'elle fasse la farouche tant qu'elle voudra: cela lui revient de temps en temps dans l'esprit: son imagination en est

doucement chatouillée, et l'on peut dire que c'est un germe qui doit produire un fruit auquel l'amant ne s'attend pas....'

The wily counsellor then advises the king to feign indifference toward the countess and to show her only the usual courtesy. The ruse succeeds and she, wounded in her vanity, makes advances by no means devoid of coquetry. The author is gifted with too much penetration to make the countess a superhuman being. She is at least partly responsible for all that happens to her, or, let us say, she is too much a woman to remain indifferent to the love of a king, and to hide the fact that she is touched. The author insists continually on the struggle between this feminine weakness, and the austere idea of duty to herself and her husband. The book ends with a eulogy of the triumph of honour over love, as though the author wished once more to call attention to his principal source. Although the passion against which the countess has to contend is less noble than that of M. de Nemours for Mme de Clèves, and although some scenes show a rather brutal realism, the battle is between idealistic sentiments and natural vanity, strengthened by a touch of physical passion which the author indicates skilfully. It is worth noticing that the defence of the countess is, like her love, essentially human. She makes no appeal to supernatural powers; her ideal of feminine honour, like that of the Princess of Clèves, is wholly rational.

Who is the author of this little novel, something of a masterpiece too in its kind? It seems to have been ascribed without question to Gatien de Courtilz until 1874, when Paul Lacroix challenged this attribution in the preface to his edition. Lacroix bases his doubt on the excellence of style, the delicacy of the dialogue and on the *mise en scène*. He believes that the author may well be Mme d'Aulnoy or Mme de Villedieu or Mlle de Roche Guilhem or 'quelque autre femme d'esprit comme il y en avait tant alors.' Livet makes no suggestion as to authorship in his edition, published two years later. For my part, I should not be surprised to learn that Bussy Rabutin had had a hand in it.

The claim of Courtilz is perhaps strong enough, since the ascription of any work to him must be governed largely by contemporary opinion, to deserve consideration. Two other works attributed to him seem to show some influence of *La Princesse de Clèves*. The first is entitled: *Les Conquêtes du Marquis de Grana dans les Pays-Bas*[1]. The marquis

[1] This book is rare. I have found but one edition, that of 1686. There is a copy, originally owned by Leber, in the public library at Rouen, and another in the British Museum. I have found none at Paris.

is sent as governor to Flanders by the king of Spain. He falls in love with a young girl of whom he might have been the father and is preferred by her mother to the rhingrave, whose age made him a more suitable match. The latter gives proof of the deepest passion after the marriage of his former sweetheart who is far from happy. She sends back his letters unopened, and when, after long intriguing, he contrives to meet her, she bitterly reproaches his accomplices, though they are her own friends. She loves him always and begs him to remain in Flanders. At last she avows her passion and consents to see him at intervals, but after the death of her husband she remains faithful to his memory, and the rhingrave resigns himself to love without hope.

This book has neither the beauty nor the psychological truth of *La Princesse de Clèves.* It is written in the slap-dash style of most of the works attributed to Courtilz and suggests no reason for preferring a new ascription. The instinct for burlesque appears in certain scenes between the rhingrave and the superior of a convent where the marquise met her lover. As to characters the husband is a jealous and brutal zany, the rhingrave is the conventional lover, and the wife a wooden marionette. Doubtless she represents the best the author could do to satisfy the taste of admirers of *La Princesse de Clèves* for virtuous women—in fiction. Courtilz gives glimpses of dissolute women who really live, but his marquise de Grana is far from convincing. His *forte* was not in such portraits.

I have more hesitation in attributing to Courtilz the second novel. But no one has challenged *l'Histoire du Maréchal, Duc de La Feuillade*[1], and I do not feel justified in detaching it from his works. The plot is simple, and, as M. Le Breton[2] has said, the first fifty pages seem to promise a little masterpiece. Unfortunately the work soon degenerates into the conventional novel of adventure and intrigue. The following is a brief summary:

The duke is passionately in love with Mlle de Halvin, a court beauty of the last years of Mazarin's ministry. The arrival of the count of Clermont interrupts the idyll, for he speedily becomes enamoured of Mlle de Halvin and his wealth wins for him the support of her family. Married to him against her inclination, she keeps alive her love for the duke. In describing her efforts to conceal her true feeling, the author is surely thinking of the *Princesse de Clèves.* The

[1] Published posthumously in 1713.

[2] See his charming though not quite accurate essay on Courtilz in the introductory chapter of *Le Roman Français au XVIII^e Siècle,* or *Un Romancier oublié* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* 15 Feb. 1897.

count soon perceives that all is not well with his wife, and takes her to Languedoc, where he has her closely watched. He becomes jealous and brutal, even corrupting his wife's servants in order to penetrate her secrets the better. The spirit of the *fabliaux* is so strong in these authors that they are unable to appreciate the delicacy which led Mme de La Fayette to make M. de Clèves a noble and sympathetic character.

La Feuillade goes to Montpellier with the court, and while there pays a visit to Clermont. Disguising himself as a domestic, he enters the service of the curé[1]. When the countess comes to confession she is received by her old lover, whom she recognizes. Recovered from a swoon, she reproaches him bitterly and returns to the château, leaving him in a faint. Her maid is more pitiful, brings back the duke to consciousness and blames the cruelty of her mistress. The latter consents to a meeting lest he die for love of her and scandal result. It may be noted that such fainting heroes are scarcely to be found in the pages of Courtilz[2]. Before the rendez-vous takes place the disguised duke is suspected by the husband and imprisoned. He is released by a clever ruse of the maid, and the count is made to feel so ridiculous that he returns with his wife to court. There she often meets La Feuillade who loses no occasion to plead his suit. At last, fearing her own weakness, she threatens to avow everything to her husband, and the duke in despair joins the Spanish army. News of his death reaches the countess, who, unable to hide her grief, tells her husband the true cause of it. La Feuillade, returning shortly after, overhears a conversation in a garden between Mme de Clermont and her maid and is assured thereby that his love is reciprocated[3]. After a number of conventional adventures, he becomes convinced that her virtue is not as immaculate as he had believed, and she is reconciled to her husband.

I have given this outline because of the few scenes which seem to recall *La Princesse de Clèves.* In the opening pages there are delicate analyses of feminine psychology and a finish of style seldom found in the works attributed to Courtilz. But, beginning with the visit of La Feuillade to Clermont, the manner changes. It seems necessary to

[1] This and occasional other incidents recall the charming Provençal verse nouvelle, *Flamenca.* Unfortunately the romance seems to have been finished by a coarser hand.

[2] It is fair to add, however, that there is to be noted in the later works attributed to Courtilz a tendency to borrow some *motifs* from the conventional novel of his time. He seems to have become acquainted with it during his second imprisonment.

[3] This scene is to be compared with that in *La Princesse de Clèves* where M. de Nemours overhears the avowal made by the princess to her husband in an arbour at Colomiers. The *raison d'être* and the result of the scene is the same in both cases.

conclude either that the author became tired or that the work comes from two hands. Certain scenes do not belie Courtilz. One other work generally attributed to Courtilz, in which a woman plays a prominent part, is the *Mémoires de la Marquise de Fresne*, a wildly romantic story showing the unmistakable influence of the popular pirate novel. No analysis of this work is needed; the marquise, both in language and action, is merely a musketeer in skirts[1].

To return to the authorship of *Le Grand Alcandre Frustré*: if we grant that the last three novels belong to Courtilz, it is obvious that he has not shown the power to portray feminine character with delicacy, or at least to carry it out to the end. In his other works his attitude towards women is that of the picaresque novelists and even of the *fabliaux*. The reasons adduced by Lacroix are reinforced by a study of Courtilz' other works. Nowhere has he shown that concern for style and for constructive symmetry which I have tried to indicate in *Le Grand Alcandre Frustré*. Lastly the importance and vivacity of dialogue in this little work indicate another hand. Courtilz reports conversation in the third person and never succeeds in using it to develop his plots. Comparison of the airy grace and sunny sparkle of the dialogue in *Le Grand Alcandre Frustré* with the lumbering tediousness of *Les Entretiens de Colbert avec M. de Bouin*—the one case in which Courtilz tried to make extensive use of conversation—compels an uncompromising rejection of his claim to the subtly malicious little masterpiece sprung from *La Princesse de Clèves* and the libelling pamphlets.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

AUSTIN, TEXAS, U.S.A.

[1] I have discussed this work in *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association of America* for Sept. 1912.

THE PASSION OF SAINT ANDREW[1].

A. Legend and Source.

If we compare the two important articles of M. Paul Meyer on the lives of saints in the thirty-third volume of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, we can hardly fail to be surprised that the Apostles have but rarely[2] been the subject of a life in verse, whereas in the prose versions in one MS. after another all the Apostles are fully dealt with. This is all the more surprising since the apocryphal writings have served as sources to a considerable number of Old French verse legends, e.g. *La Nativité Nostre Dame*, which according to M. Paul Meyer reproduces in substance[3] the *Pseudo-Matthœi Evangelium*; the *Enfance de Jésus*[4]; the *Descente de Jésus aux Enfers*[5] together with *L'Evangile de Nicodème*[6] and the *Vengeance de la mort de Nostre Seigneur*[7]. A careful examination of the age of the earliest Latin MSS. and their dissemination in France would no doubt explain this apparent contradiction, since the French verse versions are generally older than the prose adaptations.

The poet of the following *Passion of Saint Andrew* tells that after having treated of love, vanity and folly, and after having led a wild life it is now his intention to narrate a simple moral story; he is now

[1] This article was originally written in German and was expected to appear in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* in the autumn of 1914. It is only fair to state that it has benefited by several judicious remarks of the editor of that journal—Professor Hoepffner.

[2] Among the verse lives we only find the Passion of St Andrew, three versions of St John the Baptist, two versions of St John the Evangelist, and a prose version of a lost verse life of St James.

[3] *Histoire littéraire*, xxxiii, p. 366, and Rönsch in *Archiv*, lxvii, p. 85.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Trois versions publiées par* G. Paris et A. Bos (*S. a. t. fr.*).

[7] *Vide* W. Suchier in *Z. f. r. Ph.*, xxiv, p. 166, with critical text of the last three *laisses*; also appendix in Vol. xxv [cf. Registerband, p. 201].

'chapelain'[1] ('serjans' in MS. A) and means to honour God, His Son, the Holy Virgin and the whole choir of Heaven (ll. 1—144). He recalls that Andrew brought his brother Peter to Christ and how, after the Ascension, the Apostles were commanded to preach the Gospel to every creature (St Mark xvi. 15). Up to this point and for the somewhat lengthy introduction our poet uses only the well-known Bible story and moral commonplaces. From l. 161 begins the real story of Andrew—the Apostles cast lots for the provinces in which they were to preach and to St Andrew fell (*deviseie*, l. 161) Achaia. In the *Acta Andreæ et Mathiæ*[2] it is narrated that when Andrew had heard that Mathew (or Mathias, for the greatest confusion exists in the Latin and Greek MSS. between Mathew the Publican and Mathias chosen in place of Judas, Acts, ch. i) had been cast into prison, he went to his help. Mathew preached in Myrna, the town of the man-eaters, called in our MS. *Mirdone*[3]. It is regrettable that this passage in our poem only occurs in one MS., the Arsenal MS. being torn at this place. In this town Mathew had his eyes gouged out and Andrew was dragged through the streets (cf. ll. 167—9). By Andrew's intercession Mathew recovered his sight and it is easy to see why this miracle has been ascribed to Andrew since we find in the *Acta Andreæ et Mathiæ* (cap. xxi, p. 93) that Andrew laid his hands on forty blind men who were in prison and that they all at once received their sight. From line 177 on our poet translates his main source, the so-called *Passio sancti Andreæ*. This text claims to be the narration of what the priests and elders of all the churches of Achaia had seen with their own eyes and consists mainly of dialogues between Andrew and Egeas the Proconsul. Our poet retains the dialogue form and, with rare digressions into biblical commonplaces,

[1] The expression 'ses chapelains' is not quite clear, nor is it plain to what it refers; the copyist of MS. A does not seem to have understood it and replaces it by *serjans* though he spoils the measure thereby. It would probably be too rash to identify this chaplain with Andreas Capellanus the author of the treatise *de arte amandi*; the words of the poet in lines 5—14 need not be taken too literally and need certainly not imply an extensive literary activity. A court chaplain however, as Andreas was, moved in society and might well be a writer of occasional verse. According to Pio Rajna (*Studi di filologia romanza*, v, p. 265) his *Tractatus* (it may be noted that our poet calls his work *traitiers*, l. 120) dates from the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century, and Herr Trojel in his edition of this work does not attempt any closer dating. This would be rather too late for our poem but it is possible to put a first draft of Andreas' tractate as early as 1186–88 and if our poem may be safely placed at the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century, it might be the work of Andreas. If then little can be said for the authorship of Andreas Capellanus, little can be said against it.

It may well be that the expression 'ses chapelains' means no more than that our author was a chaplain of some church or other dedicated to St Andrew.

[2] *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, ed. Bonnet, cap. 3 (p. 69).

[3] Owing to the confusion between Mathew and Mathias who preached in Macedonia, we have also confusion between Myrna, Smyrna and the province Myrmidonia; from this name, it would appear, comes the Mirdone of our text.

translates carefully the narrative as found in one Latin and two Greek texts. How closely he follows his original may be seen from the following table:

Lines	187—226 =	Bonnet, *cap.*	2
	227—304 =	„ „	3
	305—360 =	„ „	4
	361—390 =	„ „	5
	391—450 =	„ „	6
	451—532 =	„ „	7
	533—602 =	„ „	8
	603—640 =	„ „	9
	641—744 =	„ „	10
	745—756 =	„ „	11
	757—768 =	„ „	12
	769—802 =	„ „	13
	803—856 =	„ „	14
	857—874 =	„ „	15

The story of the interment of St Andrew by the solicitude of Maximilia[1] (ll. 903 ff.) is to be found in various MSS. (cf. variants in Bonnet, p. 36) and with it the Passion ends. To the simple narrative of a saint's life is generally added a more or less considerable growth of miracles[2], but in this case, and this is perhaps a proof of the great age of our poem, the original text has received only one extension. Lines 913—924 of our poem translate a passage from Gregory of Tours, *Miraculorum Liber* I, cap. xxxi: 'Andreas Apostolus magnum miraculum in die solemnitatis suae profert, hoc est manna in modum farinae, vel oleum cum odore nectareo, quod de tumulo ejus exundat. Per id enim quae sit fertilitas anni sequentis ostenditur. Si exiguum profluxerit, exiguum terra profert fructum; si vero fuerit copiosum magnum arva proventum fructuum habere significat[3].'

Since this is the only miracle ascribed to St Andrew by Gregory and as others are attributed to him in various prose versions (cf. Paul Meyer, *loc. cit.* pp. 404, 408, 413, etc.) we are doubtless right in assuming that Gregory has here served our author as source.

[1] Probably not the Maximilla of the story of Mary and Jesus (cf. *Romania*, XVI, p. 251).

[2] Cf. *La Vie de saint Richard de Chichester*, published by me in *Revue des langues romanes*, LIII, pp. 247 fol.; *Liber miraculorum sancte Fidis*, ed. Bouillet; *Vie de saint Edouard le Confesseur* in *Romania*, LX, p. 67, etc. I have in preparation a number of saints' lives mainly from the Welbeck MS. (see *M. L. R.*, Vol. VI, p. 476) and nearly all contain a large number of added miracles.

[3] Quoted from *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum Patrum*, Lugduni, 1677, Tome XI.

B. Manuscripts.

The manuscripts which contain the Passion now published for the first time, are too well known to need description. They are the Oxford MS. Canonici 74[1] and the Paris Arsenal 3516[2]; I have called them O and A respectively. The first belongs to the very beginning of the thirteenth century, while the second dates from the year 1265, as is known from a calendar placed at the first page. The difference between the text of the two MSS. is slight, but on account of the greater age of the former and in consideration of two important lacunae in the latter, I had no choice but to take O as the basis of my text. So far as the orthography is concerned, I have followed O and have not considered it necessary to normalise the comparatively few differentiations in the spelling (e.g. *ei* or *e* for $e < \acute{a}$).

C. Language.

I. *Language of the Poet.*

It is evident from a number of peculiarities that the language of the poet and that of the scribe differ somewhat widely. I shall therefore confine myself to a consideration only of such forms as are assured either by the rime or by the metre.

Vowels.

§ 1. *a* calls for few remarks; the rime vowels are throughout verb forms either of the Perfect or the Future; *a* (*at*) does not even occur in rime, which fact is easily explained by the dialogue form of the story (cf. Introduction, p. 421); it may be remarked however that four or six lines are frequently rimed on the same vowel (cf. § 62). With following nasal consonant *a* only rimes with itself; *pennance* 27 rimes with *-an*. (For the hesitation between *-ence* and *-ance*, see Suchier's *Voyelles toniques*, § 39 b; a further example is supplied by the last two lines of a poem published in *Bulletin de la Soc. des anciens textes*, 1880, p. 67.)

§ 2. *ai* rimes only with itself and so too with a following consonant; the rime words are *faire*, *atraire*, *retraire*, *contraire* 13 53 etc.; *mesfait* : *forfait* 33; *jamais* : *pais* : *fais* 225 505 etc.; *ai* with a following group does not occur in the rime. Rimes in *ain(s)*, e.g. *pain* : *main* : *vain* 295 805 are all pure.

§ 3. *e* < Latin *a* is often written *ei* and so too when a vowel or a consonant follows, e.g. *eie*, *eit*, *eiz*; such endings form a quarter of the total rimes and are all pure; *-alis* becomes *-ez*, e.g. *cruez* : *entreiz* 179; for *aleie* : *demeie* 845, cf. § 8.

§ 4. *e*; Latin close *e* only occurs in *durece* : *perece* 37; *largece* : *prouece* 47; elsewhere *-itia* gives *-ise*, cf. § 9.

§ 5. Open *e* in an enclosed syllable is always kept pure, e.g. *terre* : *guerre* 883 : *conquerre* 529; *ades* : *esces* 889; *feste* : *beste* 405; *senestre* : *celeste* 703; *angnieal* : *noveal* 413 443 prove nothing.

§ 6. *e* nasal; the rimes are all pure and are very frequent; *-ence* (with exception of *pennance*, cf. § 1) only rimes with itself, 83 485 etc.; we may notice *femme* : *gemme* 381 (cf. Suchier, *loc. cit.* § 40); with following group *ẽ* is also pure, e.g. *entendre* : *aprendre* 205, cf. ll. 323 349 420 625.

[1] P. Meyer in *Archives des missions scientifiques*, 2 série, t. 5.
[2] *Vide* Index to *Romania*, p. 100 and *ibid.* xxxvii, p. 608.

§ 7. (i) *ié* never rimes with *é*; noteworthy are *avilhier* : *abaissier* 181 and *avilhiet* : *combrisiet* 569 ; in the *Miserere* (Str. cclxiii) *avilliés* rimes with *essilliés*, elsewhere only with *é*, e.g. *Rou*, II 3732 ; cf. *Vengeance Raguidel*, Intro. lxii § 18. This verb is not listed in Suchier, *loc. cit.* § 29 d. Well known are *iriet* and *amistiet* 451 573. Thrice in rime we find *desiers* : *reproviers* 701 823 953. In rime with *Andriers* (or *Andrius*) we have *traitiers* 119, *promiers* 145 361 447, *desturbiers* 673, *quiers* 773 ; the form with *ier* (suffix substitution ?) seems therefore to be well supported ; cf. P. Meyer, *Doc. MSS.* p. 26 and §§ 16, 57 below ; in the life of St Juliane in the same MS. we find *Andriu* riming with *Bartholomeu* 637. We must here notice *maniere* : *martire* 69[1] ; this phenomenon is well known to extend over a wide linguistic area.

(ii) *-iée*>*ie* occurs thrice in rime ; *maisnie* : *felonie* 645, *sanctefie* : *margerie* 615, *acomplie* : *enbracie* 717 ; this reduction is common especially before *n* and *l mouillés* and before voiceless *s*.

§ 8. The rimes fail to prove whether in the language of the poet *ę*+*i*>*i* ; there is unfortunately no instance of a word such as *mi* or *delit* riming with a pure *i* ; one single rime *demeie* (< *dimedia*) : *aleie* (past part. of *aler*) 845 seems to prove the contrary. In the *Méraugis*[2] 4159 there is somewhat similarly : *sevent* (< **sequunt*) : *sevent* (< **sapunt*) and in the *Vengeance Raguidel*[2] *plee* (< *plicat*) : *arivée* 111 (see Intro. to *Veng. Rag.* p. lvii). It has been remarked in § 7 (i) above that *desier* rimes with *reproviers* etc. Cloetta in his introduction to the *Poème moral* (p. 54) takes this form as standing for *desir* ; I am more inclined to take it as a variant for *deseier* as quoted three times by Godefroy from the *Brut* of Munich ; it is also to be found elsewhere in the Canonici MS., namely in the life of St Eufrosine (f° 104 r°, line 986) where the passage reads

De toi vëoir avoie certes grant deseier.

It is to be remarked that the copyist of A replaces this form by *desiriers* in line 701, by *desirs* l. 823 (he renders the line too short thereby), whereas in line 854 he adopts a quite different reading ; in lines 361 808 where the word is not in the rime, he writes *desir*, i.e. he everywhere rejects the form *desier* ; we shall see in § 15 below that he takes exception to almost all words with mute *e*.

§ 9. The suffix *-itia* (*-itium*) gives *-ise* ; *justise* (: *juise*) 41 ; *servise* (: *devise*) 221 ; (: *sacrefise*) 403 423 ; (: *richise*) 545 ; (: *guise*) 857 ; cf. too ll. 95 151 369 927, see also *-ece* § 4 above.

§ 10. Whether the result of open *o* in free position is *o* or a diphthong cannot be proved by the single rime *vulh* : *orguilh* 1. Other rimes in *o* are either loan words as *escole* 533, or consist of words in which *o*< *au* of various origin, e.g. *parole* 227, *enclos* 455, or else are in closed syllables, e.g. *defors* 67, *mort* : *fort* 489 etc.

§ 11. *òi* : the rimes in *-oi -oie -oies -oit -oient -oir* are all pure, e.g. *moi* : *toi* 341 583 : *voi* 719 : *croi* 329, cf. too ll. 133 159 265 325 519 559 etc., *vëoir* : *parcivoir* 843 ; *croire* : *victoire* 627.

§ 12. When followed by *s*(*z*) *òi* and *ói* are found in rime, e.g. *crois* (< *crucem*) : *crois* (< *credis*) 431 : *rois* (=*rex*) 477 621 821 : *volois* (=*voloies*) 233 315 435.

§ 13. *ó* before *r* appears as *or*(*s*) or *ur*(*s*), the rimes are very numerous (21 in all) ; before *s* the rimes *gloriose* : *preciose* 691 : *dolerose* 347 fail to show whether the development *ou* had yet been reached.

§ 14. *Judæus* appears in MS. O as *judeus* 230 and *juëz* 304 replaced by *juïs* in A, i.e. dissyllabic in both MSS. ; so too in St Juliane (*judeu* : *deu* 1251) ; in line 246 of O (this line is missing in A), however, it counts only as one syllable as in the *Poème moral* 219 b. In hiatus with a following vowel *ü* generally remains syllabic before a front vowel. In what linguistic area a pretonic *ü* may be elided

[1] These rime words are changed in MS. A.

[2] Raoul von Houdenc, *Sämtliche Werke*, hrg. Friedwagner, Halle, Niemeyer.

before the fifteenth century has, so far as I know, not been clearly determined. In England, in the West and in the North the outcome of *judæus* may be either monosyllabic or dissyllabic, as is shown in Marie de France (*Purgatoire*), Garnier (Wace, *Conception*, dissyllabic), Mousket and especially in the B and C versions of the *Évangile de Nicodème*, but not of course in the A version which, according to the editors, belongs to the Ile de France or to Champagne.

§ 15. The unaccented vowels must be considered separately.

A. *Posttonic.*

In hiatus to the tonic vowel the *e* only loses its syllabic value in *joie* 794 ; since it is elsewhere dissyllabic another explanation is offered in § 63, 7 ; but in verb endings the *e* is often dropped, e.g. *voldroi* (Condit. : *loi*) 559 and especially in the lines 541–6 (cf. § 28). *Idles* 183 is found in both MSS. (cf. *Poème moral*, p. 46).

B. *Pretonic.*

(*a*) between consonants

(i) the dropping of the *e* is only assured by both MSS. in the case of *resuscitroit* 257, *tormentrai* 422 and *derrain* 42 ; *frai* 398 579 is possibly also the correct form (cf. *Poème moral* 156 a, 289 d and Cloetta *ibid.* p. 112), while *raconterai* 914, *mangerez* 287 are uncertain.

(ii) *e* is kept in :

ferai 616, *ferois* 545, *renoverez* 288, *escolterai* 327.

(iii) a feminine *e* has been introduced by analogy in *encharteret* 107 and *entenderai* 326.

(*b*) in hiatus with the tonic vowel

(i) *e* is retained in :

pechëor 386, *postëis* 189, *benëit* 283, *recëut* 902, *recrëut* 901, *sëoi* 253.

(ii) *e* has dropped in :

castet 86 382, *jujur* 942, *justezor* 753, *pechor* 634, *benoit* 296 692 847 871 907, *nes* 303.

(*c*) in hiatus with a following vowel other than tonic

(i) *e* is retained in :

benëissons 77.

(ii) *e* has dropped in :

lezosement 735.

(*d*) Prothetic *e* is omitted : *spirs* 847 867, *spines* 475, *stablis* 687, *spiritalment* 102.

The attitude of the copyist of A towards this treatment of feminine *e* is as follows : in the case of posttonic vowels and such pretonic vowels as have been retained he acts in the same way as O [see above A and B b (ii)] ; in the case of forms with dropped *e*, he alters the lines when the phenomenon occurred in nouns wherever a change seemed possible, but accepts participial forms without *e*.

Consonants.

§ 16. Liquids.

L has dropped leaving no trace in *cruez* : *entreiz* 180 ; the form *parmenamment* 492 is rather a case of suffix change (*-ant* for *-al*) than a case of the dropping of *l* and doubling of *m*.

The pronunciation of *r* is weak as is shown by the following rimes : *majors* : *doleros* 595, *senestre* : *celeste* 703 ; this weak pronunciation might be an explanation of *traitiers* 120, but I am inclined rather to consider the form to be due to suffix change as suggested in § 57.

§ 17. Nasals.

Latin *m* < *n*, cf. *felon* : *nom* 751 : *om* 29 ; *ñ* : *n*, e.g. *signe* : *farine* 917.

§ 18. Palatals.

The outcome of *a+ki+a* appears as *-ace* and rimes only with itself; *facet* : *hacet* 35 : *enlacet* 124; *menace* : *hace* 499 : *face* 591.

An exception is formed by such words as *face* : *tache* 409 (for which the pure North Eastern form is *teke*, cf. *Miserere* str. xxix 9 and Aucassin 2, 14), such a form is a borrowing from Central French; like deviations are to be found elsewhere, cf. *Méraugis*, intro. xlii; *grace* does not occur in rime, but in the body of the line is written *grasce* as is common in the North, cf. *Carité*, intro. cxxxiii, *Poème moral* p. 96, *Cristal et Clarie* (Arsenal MS.). The matter has been treated in detail by M. Långfors in his edition of *Li Regres Nostre Dame* pp. lxxii–iv[1].

§ 19. Labials.

The rimes prove nothing for labials; *chastes* : *raisnables* 761 is mentioned in § 62; *-abilis* > *-ables* and rimes only with itself 663.

§ 20. Dentals.

The dropping of flexional *t* of the 3rd pers. sing. of the 1st conj. is proved only by one line: *Ce est li sainz qui oret ades* 889 (thus in both MSS.) and the line on account of the cesura (cf. § 63) can only be read in this way. At the end of a line the *t* of the perfect generally remains and there happens to be no rime as, for instance, *issi* (3rd sing. perf.) with *issi* (adverb). This *t* of the perfect rimes even, as often elsewhere in the North, with supported *t*, e.g. *devestut* : *fut* 733; *respondit* : *vit* 231 : *Christ* 581; other rimes of this kind are *mercit* : *Christ* 795 : *dist* 259. The rimes in *-endre* do not offer a proof whether the language of the poet knows the glide *d* or not, e.g. *entendre* : *aprendre* 205 323 349 419 : *pendre* 615.

Rimes of *-s* : *-z* are fairly common, e.g. *trefichies* : *gries* 651; *conjoiz* : *paradis* 599 847; *croiz* (*crucem*) : *rois* (*rex*) 477 621 821 : *volois* (=*voloies*) 233 315 435; *conclus* : *convenuz* 39; *Jesus* : *penduz* 229 385; *Adams* : *mananz* 367 (with biblical names common too in other texts); *blans* : *parmananz* 415 445; *tens* : *venz* 81. The suffix *-itia* gives *-ece* in four instances, cf. § 4, compared with frequent *-ise*, cf. § 9.

Morphology.

§ 21. Substantives:

(*a*) Masculine; forms assured by the metre: *sires* 189 476; *freres* 753; *maistres* 260; *boivres* 387; the analogical *s* may therefore be accepted for *freres* 132; *justicieres* 190; *lerres* 471; for further nominatives see lines 319 325 587 688. Plural forms: *torment* (: *atent*) 637; *sanior* (: *onor* acc. sg.) 211; for the sake of the rime an incorrect form is to be found in line 933—*amis* (for *ami*) : *paradis*; on the other hand correct or analogical forms spoil the rime, *li angle* : *archangles* 528; *briçons* (: *passion*, acc. sg.) 550.

(*b*) Feminine; a nominative in *s* is assured by the rimes *traïsons* (: *companions*, acc. pl.) 298; *dolors* (: *plurs*, acc. pl.) 507; the following are uncertain: *confusions* 262, *dolors* : *desonors* 321, *religions* : *mentions* 207.

§ 22. Article.

The rimes prove nothing about the forms of the article indigenous to the language of the poet.

§ 23. Adjectives and Participles:

(*a*) Masculine; the correct forms are generally used so far as rime or metre can prove; e.g. *sage* (nom. pl.) (: *corage*) 3; *contraire* (nom. pl.) (: *faire*) 53; *troveit* (: *veriteit*) 26 45 490. In retaining the forms *veriteit* : *peneiz* (nom. sg.) 256, the copyist shows himself a strict grammarian, but probably the poet intended to use *veriteiz*. Both MSS. use *salf* 356 as a kind of neuter (impersonal).

(*b*) Feminine: side by side with *grant* 553 586 680 (: *vivant*) we find *grande* 684, but the form is not certain since MS. A has *bone*. By the side of *iteil* 266 391 and

[1] Cf. too *Romanische Forschungen*, xxix, p. 118.

teil 11 14 are *iteile* 875, *queles* 207 and *quiue*[1] 858; *quele* 43 is not certain. Since *dolor* is of both genders, *cez dolors* 495 is uncertain.

The forms of the possessive are but slightly dialectic, e.g. *noz* as masc. nom. sg. 267 479; elsewhere Central French forms are used, e.g. 46 140 297 301 601 898.

§ 24. Pronouns.

(*a*) Personal: the strong form in hiatus *ju*[2] occurs 5 269 681; *lui* (: *sui*) 126; in composition *nel* 52; *jes* 598; *ses* 150; also *l'en* (=*li en*) 122; especially common are the strong forms of the pronoun before finite verbs, e.g. *moi enlacet* 124; *moi entendoies* 265 and also ll. 59 228 306 315 384 625 719 side by side with the rarer, weak and elided form 722.

(*b*) Relative: we may note *ce que* as a neuter 356; *i* and *u* referring to persons may be noted here: 198 587–8 650.

(*c*) Indefinite: we find only *l'om* 15 and *om* 434; *tuit* (: *bruit*) 662.

§ 25. Adverbs.

Non and *nen* often stand before verbs beginning with a vowel: 346 456 474 and perhaps also l. 134. We may notice here the frequency of *ens en* with *croiz* 256 etc. (cf. § 65), *sospiramment*, cf. § 57.

§ 26. Prepositions.

De introducing a 'logical subject' occurs in l. 744; however in l. 486 this *de* is omitted in O where A introduces it [cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, I Reihe, p. 5].

Verb Inflexion.

§ 27. Present.

The first person sing. pres. indic. of the 1st conjugation shows forms with and without *e*, e.g. *desir* (: *departir*) 826; *desire* (: *martire*) 488 676; 1st pl. *poomes* 70 (different in A); *-ons* rimes only with itself 23 73 77 91 99 etc. The 2nd pl. ends in *-eiz*, *-ez* (also Future 287) *gardeiz* : *metteiz* 649.

§ 28. Imperfect and Conditional.

The endings of the 1st and 2nd persons sing. of the imperf. and condit. which seem to belong to the poet are *-oi*, *-ois*, e.g. *voldroi* (: *loi*) 559; (*voloi* (: *loi*) in A); *volois* (: *crois*) 439 accepted by A. In other cases the copyist of A tries to get rid of these forms. In the lines 541–6 where a whole list of them occurs, he uses the forms of the future as is shown in the variants.

In the 3rd pers. the forms only rime with one another.

In O *eret*, dissyllabic, occurs in lines 478 688 908 where A replaces by *estoit*.

§ 29. Future.

Of the 1st conjugation we find forms with feminine *e* dropped: *racontrai* 914, *tormentrai* 422 (also in A), *mang(e)rez* 287 but *escolterai* 327. Belonging to other conjugations we have *prenderunt* 498 (also in A), *entenderai* 328, *frai* 3 579 etc. and *ferai* 616, cf. § 15. Instead of *sentrez* 523, MS. A has *souffrez*.

§ 30. Perfect.

To the 3rd pers. sing. applies what is said in § 1; the rimes *criarent* : *crucefiarent* 249 prove nothing and they should perhaps be altered; however, *disputarent* stands once in the body of the line 152.

§ 30a. There is little to remark on the subjunctive; we quote the forms *doinst* 835, *ost* 811, but *proiet* 944, *defendet* : *prendet* 875; *face* (: *tache*, cf. § 18) 409 and *recevist* : *pendist* 699.

[1] *quieus*, *queus* and *quius* exist elsewhere, but this form, if it be correct, I have not met elsewhere.

[2] This form belongs perhaps only to the copyist, cf. Wilmotte in *Romania*, XVIII, p. 216, § 25.

§ 31. The only imperative forms worthy of note are : *oi* 233 ; *rezoif* 712 726 ; *croi* 551 ; *prent* 730 ; *reconquier* 574.

§ 32. Infinitive.

At the rime we have only *vëoir* : *parcivoir* ; these form the only rime in *-oir* ; *veïr* does not occur.

II. *Language of the copyist of O.*

Three distinct copyists were engaged on the composition of MS. Canonici 74, and ours is not the same as he who copied the *Poème moral*, whose language agrees in the main with that of the author of that poem[1]; we must endeavour to discover therefore whether our copyist belongs to the same linguistic area, or in what particulars he differs therefrom.

Vowels.

A. *Stressed vowels.*

§ 33. Latin *a*.

(1) free *a* in our poem appears almost always as *ei*, e.g. *ameiz* 3 ; *teil* 11 12 14 etc. ; *vaniteit* 7 ; *meir* 112 and *passim* ; more rarely do we find *e*, e.g. *vanitet* 25 ; *sermoner* 156 ; always *frere*, *pere*, *mere* 49 50 ; at the rime we find now *ei* and now *e* ; with a following feminine *e* the only spelling is *eie*, e.g. *espeie* 110 ; *aleie* 846. The ending *-arunt* appears as *-arent*, e.g. *disputarent* 152, cf. § 30.

(2) *a* after palatals generally gives *ie*, e.g. *chief* 475 ; *pechiez* 24 ; *traitiet* 5 ; for this *ie* the scribe may substitute *e* as in *pechet* 36, or *i* as in *chir* 81.

(3) free *a* before nasal becomes *aĩ* ; *pain* : *main* 295 ; *derrain* 42 ; enclosed *a* becomes *ã*, e.g. *sans* 292.

(4) *a* with epenthetic *i* becomes *ai*, e.g. *fais* 396 ; *forfait* 33 etc. ; that *ai* is a descending diphthong is shown by *anz* (for *ainz*) 699 863 and the spelling *ait* for *a(t)* 854.

(5) *a* + *u̯* > *ou*, e.g. *clou* 651.

§ 34. Open *e*.

(1) free *e* appears as *ie*, e.g. *gries* 339 ; *quiert* 549 ; *siege* 539 ; or as half learned *e* in *secle* 428 514 866.

(2) enclosed *e* appears as *ei*, e.g. *beiles*[2] 851 ; *-ellum*, *-ellos*, *-eaz* 219 ; *ceaz* 313 ; *noveal* 414 ; *aneal* 408 413.

(3) free *e* + nasal > *ien*, e.g. *bien*, but also *in* e.g. *tinent* 212 ; *vinent* 661.

(4) free *e* + epenthetic *i* > *i*, e.g. *mi* 111 ; *enmi* 865.

(5) free *e* + palatal + *r* > *ier*, e.g. *entiers* 416 446.

(6) *Deum* appears as *Deu* and *Deus*.

§ 35. Close *e*.

(1) free *e* becomes *oi*, e.g. *voir* 62 ; *crois* 477 and with following palatal *rois* 478.

(2) before nasal (*a*) free, > *-ain*, e.g. *plains* 427 895 ; *mainent* 658 ;
(*b*) before consonant group > *-en*, e.g. *prendre* 205.

(3) after palatal > *i*, e.g. *mercit* 32 ; *plaisir* 269.

(4) before *u* > *iu*, e.g. *pius* and *piu* (< *pius*) always monosyllabic 893 etc.

(5) Learned *i* remains *i* : *discipulus* > *desciple* 419.

§ 36. Latin long *i* remains as *i* and calls for no remarks.

§ 37. Open *o*.

(1) with the exception of *cuer* 31 426 ; *suer* 50, *o* is not diphthongised or rather an early diphthong is reduced to *o*, cf. § 10 ; the same is true with a following *l mouillé* and *l* + cons., e.g. *vuls* 324 ; *vult* 21 ; *vul* (1st pers.) 27 and noun 700 ; *dol* 754 ; *olz* 819.

[1] Cloetta in *Poème moral*, p. 12, and Wilmotte, *Romania*, XVI, p. 118.

[2] Except for an example in *Poème moral*, 61 a, this spelling is unknown to me.

(2) *locum* gives *liu* 10 12.
(3) with following nasal *o* remains: *bones* 721 764.

§ 38. Close *o*.

(1) written *o* and *u*: *jor* (sole spelling) 403 etc.; *poor* 425; *amur* 5 704; *creatur* 191; *laburs* 806; *u* (=*ubi*) 568; *pour* 346 697.
(2) with nasal *on*, *un*: *onkes* 697; *unkes* 474; *encontremont* 805; *unt* 808.
(3) In learned words *o* + *i* > *oi* and may appear as *o*, e.g. *glore* 336; *victore* 628.

§ 39. Latin long *u*.

(1) with nasal may be written *on*: *cascon* 920, cf. *Poème moral*, p. 82 (31) and Wilmotte, *Romania*, XVI, p. 560, § 21.
(2) In the 3rd person of perfects we have frequently *reciut* 237 etc.; *biut* 414; and also *biet* 444.

§ 40. Latin *au*.

(1) appears as *o*: *parole* 227; *chose* 11.
(2) with epenthetic *i* > *oi*: *joie* 6; *oi* 233.

B. *Unstressed vowels.*

§ 41. Latin *a*.

(1) remains unchanged: *flael* 79; *rachateies* 365; *paur* 499.
(2) *a* + epenthetic *i* > *ai*, *a* or if post-secondary *i*: *raison* 1; *vraiement* 159; *aez* 489; *falle* 720; *granior* 376; *vraement* 101; *ochison* 43; *orison* 733.
(3) with nasal > *-an*: *ancor* 778.

§ 42. Latin *ĕ*, *ē*, *ĭ*.

(1) appear as *a* and, before labial, *o*: *astois* 26; *ramembrance* 861; *promiers* 145 362 379 824; *promierement* 105; *promerains* 367.
(2) with nasal > *en* and *an*: *seniorie* 374 428; *condemneiz* 20; *sanior* 211 401 448; *anemis* 59; *dampner* 377 390 etc., i.e. these nasals are less carefully kept separate than in stressed syllables.
(3) with epenthetic *i* > *oi* and also *i* and *u*: *loiet* 108; *soiet* 111; *noiet* 111; *proiet* 175; *esvoillet* 22; *delitat* 384; *parcivoir* 844; *recivroit* 160 302; *aparistroit* 258; *devïons*[1] 91; *foluet*[2] 9.
(4) remain as *i*: *omnipotent* 412; *vestiment* 736.
(5) remain as *e*: *enfreie* (for *enfreée*) 757.

§ 43. Latin open *o*.

(1) remains: *corage* 4; *doleros* 596; *onereie* 903; *onorat* 911; *ochison* 43; *lowier* 861.
(2) with epenthetic *i* > *oi* and *ui*: *poissanz* 401 437; *quidas* 62.

§ 44. Latin close *o*.

(1) remains *o*: *sovent* 5; *jovente* 9; *jovence* 11; *dotance* 28; *redotez* 342; *doblement* 104.
(2) appears as *ou*: *prouece* 48.
(3) appears as *u*: *desturbeit* 275 487 769; *returneir* 560.
(4) with epenthetic *i* > *oi*: *conoistre* and *i* in a post-secondary syllable: *conissance* 428; *conistras* 450.
(5) with nasal > *un*: *muntent* 807; and as post-secondary *en*: *volenteit* 717.
(6) Post-secondary also *e* and *o*: *doleros* 596; *onereie* 903; *onorat* 911.

[1] In O the rime words of lines 91, 92 are *deivions* : *deparlons* and in A *deparlons* : *dedaignons*; I am inclined to consider the word as coming from a verb which in Central French is *desvoier*, but it may be that we should read *deinions* (i.e. *-ini-* stands as the sign of the *n mouillé*). The reading of A certainly gives colour to this supposition.
[2] This form should perhaps be kept in the text; cf. *foloiet* in *Vie de Sainte Juliane*, 776 and *Aiol*, 4473; Note of Foerster in his edition.

§ 44 a. As belonging to the copyist I reckon such forms as have a non-syllabic *e* standing in hiatus to the tonic vowel: e.g. *pecheor* 215 776; *beneoite* 154 693; *deceute* 562; *rezeute* 824.

Consonants.

§ 45. Liquids.

It has been pointed out in § 16 that *l* has dropped without leaving any trace, so too in the language of the copyist *l* is often omitted: *aisiz* 388 = Central Old French *aisil* < **acetulum*[1]; *fiez* 388; *fos* 429; *vitosement* 617; *u* for *l* before cons. appears in *angneax* (*x*=*us*), *auteir* 330 327; but *haltismes* 621; *multon* 406; *salf* 20 356; *viltosement* 755; *voldrai* 271. *L mouillé* is represented by (i) *lh* in *vulh* 1; (ii) *ilh* in *orguilh* 2; (iii) *ll* in *mervelle* 426; *falle* 519 780; *esvoillet* 22; (iv) *illi* in *baillie*. Transposition of *r* is rare, e.g. *sofferras* 632 637.

§ 46. Nasals.

Final *m* > *n*: *fun* 407; before initial labial *n* may become *m*: *em meir* 112; *em paradis* 783.

N mouillé is represented in various ways: (1) by *n*: *companie* 267; (ii) by *ni*: *companions* 297; *dedenios* 642; *loniat* 303; (iii) *ng*: *venget* 59; *vieng* 711; (iv) by *ngn*: *angneax* 413; (v) by *ngni*: *vengniet* 30; *angnieal* 443. Doubling of the nasal takes place with *a* and *e*, which should mean that these vowels are nasalised, e.g. *anme* (commonly *arnme*); *femme*: *gemme* 381; *pennance* 27 58; *parmanamment* 492; cf. §§ 16, 57; with other vowels this gemination is not found.

§ 47. Gutturals and palatals.

(1) Initial and medial *c* before *a* or an *a* which develops into another vowel:

(i) becomes as a rule *ch*: *char* 14 406 413; *chaït* 870; *chaitif* 623 637; *chartre* 458; *chiers* 924; *chose* 703; *pechiez* 24; *ochison* 43; *acheant* 840; *vochat* 149.

(ii) or remains *c*: *castes* 761; *cascun* 403 496.

(2) Before *e*, *i* or suffixes, *c* appears as

(i) *c*: *descendez* 131; *ce* 99; *cil* 375; *ceaz* 813; *ciel* 840; *celeste* 703.

(ii) *sc*: *grasce* 895 (also *graces* 290), cf. § 18.

(iii) *z*: *ze est* 292; *z'astoit* 262; *comenzat* 150; *nunzat* 150; *sospezoi* 306; *dezoit* 220; *rezoi* 261; *rezoit* 712 716; *rezoivet* 828; *rezeute* 824; *justezor* 247 753; *dulzor* 585.

(iv) *ch* (once only): *deschendues* 364[2].

(3) voiced guttural remains as *g*, and also there where in Central French it has disappeared: *longement* 23; but *segure* 158; *asegure* 514; *segurement* 636; these three words are never in any other form in our poem.

(4) *qu* (*kw*) appears as *c*: *coi* 666; as *gu*: *enguel* 74 (see variant at this line); as *k*: *relenkir* 555 and often *ke* 555 etc.

(5) *tj* > *s*: *raison* 1; *araisonet* 188; or *c*: *ensalces* 672.

§ 48. Labials.

(1) Final *f* sometimes drops: *rezoi* 261 (side by side with *rezoif* 712 716); *ser* 663.

(2) Under learned influence *p* may remain: *baptistere* 160; *comdampneie* 210.

(3) In place of *f*, *v* we may find *p*: *espoldre* 839; *sepelit* 912.

(4) *-bl-* remains: *diable* (always trisyllabic) 216 366.

(5) There is no glide *b* in the group *ml*: *humle* 762.

§ 49. Sibilants and dentals.

(1) In the body of a word *s* before consonant is silent and has often disappeared: *traït* 242 254; *devions* 91, but it is found in *mesfait* 46; *ostons* 89 etc.

[1] Cf. *Romania*, XXI, p. 87.

[2] It is worth noting that it is only in *descendre* that forms with *ch* are found in the *Poème moral* also; cf. Cloetta's edition in *Romanische Forschungen*, III, p. 96.

(2) *s* and *z* have the same sound, the written sign is generally *z*: *escolteiz* 3; *argenz* 48; *croiz* 118; *foiz* 897; *toz* almost without exception, further *toz jors* 54 715; *muz* 171; *sainz* 128; but *fois* 29; *surs* 172; *mors* 169; *redotes* 342.

(3) The mutation of *t* has been already mentioned in § 20, but it often remains in writing, e.g. *traitiet* 5; *vaniteit* 7; examples are very numerous.

(4) In one instance *d* is found: *foid* (*fidem*) 344.

(5) The glide *d* stands between *l* and *r* in *voldrai* 271 359, but not in *venrat* 41.

§ 50. Double consonants and single consonants are written in cases where we expect the opposite: *porons* 43; *poront* 51; *poras* 324; *enssi* 465; *pennance* is explained in § 46.

§ 51. Case inflexion. (1) The late forms with *s* are native to the copyist: *maistres* 731; *misteres* 315 520 and also *savoirs* 48 547, but *pere* 49; with feminine substantives also we have *s* forms: *orisons* 733; *passions* 635; *la genz* 757 758; *pitiez* 39; *vilteiz* 701 (cf. *vilteit*, acc. in the same line); the first declension is usually according to rule: *amis* 50; *cusins* 50, but cf. § 21.

(2) With adjectives there are no deviations from grammatical rule; we find therefore *li sainz hom* 687; nom. sing. masc. *blancs* 410; *plains* 31 etc.; *privez* 243; *fos* 429; *justes* 29; with feminine nouns the later form predominates: *granz folie* 547 but also *grant*. In impersonal phrases we find *bien est droiz* 409.

(3) The possessive forms are *noz* (masc. nom. sing.) 267 479; and acc. pl. 64 515, cf. § 23.

§ 52. Pronouns. These call for little remark.

(1) *li*=masc. weak form 259 263; *nos*, *vos* are always so written and are never confused with the adjectives; the frequent use of strong forms before the finite verb has been noticed in § 24.

(2) Between *tot* and *tuit* the copyist fails to distinguish: e.g. in line 275, MS. A has altered *tot* to *mult*; masc. nom. pl. *tuit* (and *trestuit* 100) are frequent: 3 53 520 375 etc.

§ 53. Verbs. There is little to add to what has been said in §§ 27—32.

(1) The 3rd pers. pres. indic. of *aler* is always *vait* 883.
(2) The 1st pers. perf. of *avoir* is *ou* 679.
(3) The 3rd pers. perf. of *cheoir*=*chaït* 870.
(4) In the perf. of *boivre* we have *biet* 444 as well as *biut* 414 817.
(5) The 1st pers. pres. indic. of *faire* is *faz* 403.
(6) The 2nd pers. sing. perf. subj. of *croire*=*creïsses* 352.

§ 54. *N* inorganic.

In MS. Canonici inorganic *n* occurs very frequently; I quote only *enfreer* 757; *engarde* 593, with common *esgarde* 689 etc.; *enguardeir* 779; *ensalcier* 672 737, all of which are replaced in MS. A by forms in *es-*. For a lengthy treatment of this subject, see Balcke, *Der anorganische Nasallaut im Französischen*, No. 39 of the *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*.

§ 55. Hiatus.

(1) with *ce* and *je* (*ju*): *ce est* 292 889 (also in A) 285 (otherwise in A); *ju ai* 269 681.

(2) with *li*: *li uns* 806.

(3) 'logical':

(i) with *et*:

(α) *Et destruirë et avilhier* (both MSS.) 182.
(β) *Grant frinte i ot, tencë et ire* 459 (see variant).
(γ) *Adulterë et homecide* 98.

(ii) with consonant group:

(α) *Et la moie anrmë est perdue* 357.
(β) *Ki en enfer t'anrmë atent* 792.
(γ) *Si vos n'estes martrë el cors*[1] 67.
(δ) *Et de vivrë et de morir* (both MSS.) 270.

(iii) to show emphasis:

(α) *Vint milï ome de present* 745.
(β) *Mannë i surt par mut grant signe*[2] 917.

§ 56. Elision.

Elision occurs even with a written *t*: *...ore(t) ades* 889 and also *commence a* 130; *face il* 832.

§ 57. Separate words.

comander 156 in O without *à*; cf. Soltmann, *Frz. Studien*, I, 397.

esderver 337 669, Godefroy (supp.) only quotes *enderver*; the word is not in Balcke's work, cf. § 54.

esces 890, the Dictionnaire général has no instance earlier than 1315.

parmanamment 492, cf. § 46, only in Eastern texts.

pum 384, this form seems to occur only very rarely; our poem is probably the earliest instance of its use.

senestre 703, in the sense of *fâcheux* not quoted in Godefroy before Christine de Pisan.

sermoner a 156, cf. *Cor. Loois*, 51; not in Soltmann, see above.

strendors 508 = gnashing of the teeth: see my article in *Z. f. r. Ph.* 1914, p. 376.

sospiramment 746, not in Godefroy.

traitiers 120, Godefroy quotes (viii, p. 7 a) *traitier* twice in the sense of 'ce qu'on a à dire, à proposer' and cites the word in the second case in rime with *approchier*; the instance is however very late (Cuvelier, Du Guesclin); in the *Supplément* (x, p. 797 a) however he has *traitié* in the sense of 'ouvrage où l'on traite d'une matière.' Our instance rimes indeed only with *Andriu*, but since this name rimes five times with words ending in *-ier* (cf. § 7 (i)) it seems probable that the poet wished to write *traitier*; it should be noticed, however, that A has *traities*.

§ 58. So far as the home of our poet is concerned, the following phenomena may be brought together without however leading to more than a partial solution of the question:

1. Distinction of *ã* from *ẽ* (Norm., Wall., Pic.), cf. §§ 1, 2, 6.
2. Distinction of *ã* from *ẽ* with subsequent consonant group, cf. §§ 6, 20.
3. Distinction of *aĩ* from *eĩ*, cf. § 2.
4. *iée* > *ie* (Norm., Burg., Lorr., Wall., Pic.), cf. § 7 (ii).
5. *ẽ*+*i̯*+*e* > *eie*, cf. § 9 and below § 60 (ii) (*a*), (*b*), (*c*).
6. *o̜*+*i* > *ui* [*tuit* : *bruit*], cf. § 10.
7. Latin free open *o* appears as *o̜*, cf. § 10 and note.
8. *o̜i*: *o̜i* here only with following *s*, cf. § 12 and § 60 below.
9. Mutation of the pretonic feminine *e* (Wall.), cf. § 15.
10. Dropping of prothetic *e* (Wall., Pic.), cf. § 15 (*d*).
11. Development of *ə* between dentals and *r* (Anglo-Fr., Champ., Lorr., Wall., Pic.), cf. § 15.
12. Retention of *d* in *prendet*, etc. (Wall., Pic.), cf. § 30 a.
13. Complete disappearance of *l* before consonant (Wall., Lorr.), cf. § 16.
14. Weak pronunciation of *r* (Wall., Pic.), cf. § 16.
15. Use of possessive adj. as in Central Fr. (Wall.), cf. §§ 23, 51.
16. Ending *-omes* (Champ., Wall., Pic.), cf. § 27.
17. Weak ending in the subjunctive (Wall., Pic.), cf. § 30 a.
18. Use of rimes which are not strictly dialectic (Wall., Central Fr.), cf. § 18.

[1] Not certain since A has *de* instead of *el*.

[2] *Manne* should perhaps be altered to *mannes*, cf. 921. For this question of hiatus, see G. Rydberg, *Zur Geschichte des französischen ə* (Upsala, 1907), p. 94 fol.

§ 59. On the other hand the following dialectic phenomena are lacking:

19. *e* in enclosed position > *ie* (Wall. and in portions of Picardy).
20. *ẽ* or *ĩ* + nasal > *-ain* (Wall.).
21. *ol* + cons. > *au* (Wall. and portions of Picardy).
22. *ō* before *r* > *eu*, *ou* (Wall., North Champ.).
23. *-ivu* > *iu* (Wall., Pic.).
24. Lack of glide *d* (Wall.), cf. § 20.
25. (*a*) Case endings *mi*, *ti* (Lorr., South Wall., Pic.).
(*b*) Case endings *men*, etc. (Norm., Lorr., Wall., Pic.).
(*c*) Possessives *nos*, *no*, etc. (Wall., Pic.) partly wanting, cf. § 23.
(*d*) Pronoun *les*=*lor* (Wall., cf. *Romania*, XV, p. 130).
(*e*) Article, fem. nom. *li* (Wall.).

26. Lack of the ending *-evet* < *-abat*. The introduction of this ending into Walloon begins perhaps only later than the date of our poem, but it does occur in the *Poème moral* (cf. Wilmotte in *Romania*, XVII, p. 567).

§ 60. In endeavouring by a process of elimination to arrive at a definite result we see:

(i) that the nos. 1 to 4 of §§ 58, 59 prove nothing definite.
(ii) that (*a*) the phenomenon cited at no. 5 belongs to a wide linguistic territory which lies on the right and left bank of the Meuse and stretches over the Lorraine border [cf. Gröber's *Grundriss*, Map xi]; (*b*) but it must be noticed that the rime *demeie* : *aleie* (l. 845) must have *e* as its stressed syllable and that *demi* somewhat south of Liège is still pronounced *dmẹi* [Horning, *Z. f. r. Ph.* XII, p. 259]; (*c*) this speaks therefore for the Northern portion of Walloon territory.
(iii) that according to Wilmotte (*loc. cit.* § 19) *o*+*i* in Liège becomes *ui* but in a somewhat restricted degree, while in the other places whose dialectic peculiarities he studied other developments resulted.
(iv) that our one instance (§ 58. 7) of *ɔ* < *o* belongs possibly only to the scribe.
(v) that the identity of *oi* and *oi* appears in a number of texts of the twelfth century [e.g. *Roman d'Alexandre*, *Renaut de Montauban*, *Floovant*, *Aye d'Avignon*; cf. Rossmann in *Frz. Studien*, I, 162 and to those texts adduced by Rossmann comes *Les Quatre Fils Aymon*, pub. Castets in the *Revue des langues romanes*, e.g. *crois* (*crucem*) : *cortois* 6217 etc.] and that therefore a closer defining of the home of our author is again to seek.
(vi) that nos. 9 to 14 belong to the whole territory.
(vii) that no. 15 probably indicates only a literary use, although such forms are to be found in Liège (cf. Wilmotte, *loc. cit.* § 45 and § 61 below).
(viii) that the ending *-omes* is to be found in the above-mentioned texts (see Rossmann, and also *savomes* in an *o-e* assonance in *Quatre Fils Aymon* 5985 side by side with *savon(s)*, common in the body of the line) but only south of Liège itself.
(ix) that *ie* < checked *e* (cf. § 59, 19 above) is wanting in our text and also in the old documents of Liège ['*ie* < *e* entravé constitue, jusqu'à 1270 environ, une présomption défavorable à l'origine liégeoise d'un texte littéraire,' Wilmotte, *loc. cit.* § 11].
(x) that the development of *-or* to *-eur* (cf. § 59, 22) is too late for our poem (see Wilmotte, *loc. cit.* § 16 and Cloetta, p. 65).
(xi) that the case endings cited in § 59, 25, etc. occur exceptionally in Liège and also rarely to the south of Liège (Wilmotte in *Romania*, XVIII, p. 217, § 45); they are however common in *Eufrosine* in the same MS. as our poem, though it must be conceded that they are weakened there to *me*; that *mi* often occurs in the assonances in the *Ver del Juïse*, but not in the strophic rimes of the *Eufrosine*.

Taking these results together we arrive at the conclusion that our poet was not a Liégeois but that he belongs to the northern portion of the Walloon linguistic territory.

§ 61. Language of the scribe.

We will compare the phenomena of our poem discussed in §§ 33–53 with those mentioned by Cloetta in his edition of the *Poème moral* (= P.m.)[1].

(i) Latin free *a* develops here in the same way as there [pp. 43–46] except that the copyist of P.m. never writes *-arent* in the perfect [p. 41] whereas ours does (cf. Wilmotte, *Romania*, XVII, § 50).

(ii) Of the orthographies *e* and *i* < *ie* only *i* occurs in P.m. [p. 45].

(iii) In the case of *a* + *n* or *m* our scribe does not recognise the orthography *nm* [p. 49] nor *-ant* or *-ent* for *-aint*; but we do find in our poem *ait* for *at* (§§ 33, 34), cf. [p. 77].

(iv) *ai* is never represented by *e*; so too in P.m. [p. 50].

(v) In unstressed syllable *en* and *an* are interchangeable, so too in P.m. [p. 51].

(vi) Although *ie* < *ę* always appears as *ie*, yet *in* may stand for *ien* (§ 34, 3); so too in P.m. [p. 53].

(vii) In the body of the line *ę* + *i* > *i* (§ 34, 4), so too P.m. [p. 54].

(viii) Checked *ę* > *ei* as in P.m. [p. 56, 11 *a*] occurs, but never in the form of *ie* as in P.m. [p. 56, 11 b].

(ix) *-ellum* and *-ellos* give *eal* and *eaz* as in P.m.; an orthography which, according to Wilmotte (*loc. cit.* § 9), is indigenous to the dialect of Liège.

(x) Our scribe does not appear to know the reduction of *oi* < *ę* to *o* [p. 58, 14 a].

(xi) *e* + nasal > *ain* as in P.m.; *poine* and *mains* however do not occur [p. 58, 14 a].

(xii) The ending *-itium* (*-itia*) gives *-ise* as in P.m. and also *justicieres* (l. 190) and *justezor* (§ 15). In the *Vie de Juliane* : *justiciers* : *heretiers*.

(xiii) Open *o* generally appears as *ǫ* (§ 37), otherwise in P.m. except in the present of *vouloir* where both copyists agree.

(xiv) *Locum* > *liu* also in P.m.; *judæus* however gives *juez* (§ 14) but not so in P.m. [p. 69].

(xv) For close *o* (and also before nasal) we have the same orthography in our poem as in P.m. [p. 69].

(xvi) In learned words in *-oire* (§ 38, 4) here and in P.m. [p. 75] the spelling *-ore* is found.

(xvii) Unstressed vowels are treated in the same way in both poems.

(xviii) With liquids and nasals the same orthographies are known in our poem (§ 45) as in P.m. [pp. 90–94].

(xix) With gutturals and palatals the common spelling *z* is to be found in both poems; it is noteworthy too that *ch* (*c*) only occurs in *descendre* (§ 47, 2 iv).

(xx) In the verb *sivre* we have no forms with *w* as in P.m. [p. 98].

(xxi) *s* before consonant has disappeared in both poems.

(xxii) The orthography *foid* is to be noticed here (§ 49, 4) and in P.m. [p. 105].

(xxiii) *Li* as feminine form of the article does not occur in our poem, whereas it does in P.m. [p. 108].

(xxiv) Later forms of the noun with *s* (§ 51) seem commoner in our poem than in P.m. [p. 109].

(xxv) In the conjugations (*α*) many forms are similar in both poems: e.g. *fuist* = *fust*; *ait* = *at*; *ou* (perfect); *biet* = *biut*; *prendet* etc.; and (*β*) many are different: e.g. *eret* (§ 28, dissyllabic), cf. P.m. [p. 113], and especially is it noticeable that our poem has no forms in *-eve* (§ 59, 26).

From this analysis it appears that our scribe does not belong to the same district as that of the *Poème moral*, but if he is not a Liégeois his home cannot be far from Liège. The map in Bédier's *Légendes épiques* (IV, p. 242) shows the great wealth and importance of the abbey of Stavelot-Malmédy; it would not be too rash to place our scribe somewhere in that neighbourhood.

[1] Our paragraphs above are quoted in '§' in ( ), and the pages of Cloetta's introduction by 'p.' in [ ].

D. Rime and Metre.

§ 62. The rime is on the whole correct, only in a few instances does the poet allow himself small licences. In lines 167–8, 261–2 exact rime is sacrificed to grammatical accuracy, whereas in ll. 933–4 the opposite is the case. On two occasions simple assonance is considered sufficient; *castes* : *raisnables* 761–2; *grant* : *an* 919–20. Such inexactitudes are elsewhere not uncommon in North French poems, e.g. *Miserere*, str. 68, 86 (cf. Van Hamel, intro. cxxxiii). One phenomenon of our poem should however call for remark: it contains several instances of a number of lines riming on the same vowel: e.g.

four in *-at* 817–20,
four in *-eit* 107–110, 785–88,
four in *-eiz* 387–90,
six in *-ment* 101–106.

This is a common phenomenon in Anglo-French poems, but is much rarer in continental works; a good example of the latter is *Guillaume de Dole*: 5–8, 2616–21, 2818–21, 3159–62 etc.

§ 63. The question whether the octosyllabic line may have a cesura has been frequently discussed, and in a recent dissertation[1] answered very definitely in the affirmative so far as the oldest French poems are concerned. Of our poem it can certainly not be affirmed that the very common pause in the middle of the line 'arises unsought and involuntarily out of the nature of the line and the language[2].' With the exception of those lines that have hiatus (cf. § 55) and of the line 794, which is dealt with in sub-section 7 below, our poem consists of 936 lines. A careful examination of each single line has given the following results:

(1) (*a*) The fourth syllable carries a strong stress and is also final, e.g.

Une raisón dire vos vulh,
Tot simplemént et senz orguilh. (ll. 1, 2.)

801 instances.

(*b*) or a feminine final *e* is elided with a following vowel, e.g.

Et qui la víe el cors nos mist. (l. 18.)

18 instances.

(2) The fourth syllable again carries a strong stress, but is followed by a feminine—mute—*e* (*e, es, ent*), which counts as a fifth syllable, e.g.

(*α*) Forment soi véngnie(t) del felon. (l. 30.)
(*β*) Li pius apóstles cant l'oït. (l. 231.)
(*γ*) Et il guerpírent grant richise. (l. 151.)

41 instances.

(3) The fourth syllable is again final, but the grammatical stress falls on the third; such lines have a kind of feminine cesura, e.g.

Ce qu'il aimet, trestuit amons. (l. 100.)

48 instances.

(4) (*a*) The fourth syllable is final, but does not carry the stress, e.g.

Ki es pechiez granz seront pris. (l. 60.)

17 instances.

(*b*) or the *e* is elided, e.g.

Et par sa dulce oration. (l. 878.)

1 instance.

[1] Melchior, *Der Achtsilbler in der altfrz. Dichtung mit Ausschluss der Lyrik*, Leipzig, 1907.
[2] 'Etwas aus der Natur des Verses und der Sprache ungesucht und ungewollt Hervorgehendes,' Tobler, *Versbau*, 5th edition, p. 111.

(5) Lines which appear to have no cesura, e.g.

Et par sa bone volenteit. (l. 300.)

4 instances (297, 300, 301, 913).

(6) Lines in which the lack of a strongly marked cesura appears to be characteristic; such only occur in our poem when there is enjambement, e.g. the second line in:

Car ce dist Deus: qui dampnera
Son proeme, condempneiz sera. (ll. 93–4.)

6 instances (94, 104, 229, 386, 419, 884).

(7) The line 794 has been noted as too long; it is however to be found in both MSS. and must therefore be looked on as having an epic cesura, and may be compared with certain lines of the *Passion Christi*, e.g.

Jesus reis magnes est sus montez. (*Passion*, l. 26.)

It can hardly be a cause for surprise, however, that in a poem where in verb forms a feminine *e* is often omitted (cf. § 15 A) the same process should take place in the case of a noun.

(8) Out of the 468 couplets of our poem 344 are masculine and 124 feminine rimes.

(9) The rule of the couplet set out by Paul Meyer in *Romania*, XXIII, pp. 1–30, is very seldom broken in our poem.

(10) Except in the instances mentioned in no. 6 above, enjambement occurs very rarely, e.g. 414, 602, 798.

§ 64. From the metrical phenomena set out in the preceding paragraph it is evident that the rhythm of our poem is to be described as peculiarly archaic. Only the *Passion*, the *vie de saint Léger* and the history of *Mont S. Michel* show a similar archaic treatment of the octosyllable[1]; according to Melchior's dissertation these poems show a percentage of lines with cesura of 97·5; 97·5 and 97·6 respectively, whereas our text, counting the instances under nos. 1, 2 and 3 together, shows a percentage of 97·01.

§ 65. Editors of Old French texts have seldom mentioned rhythm as an aid to textual criticism; so far as I have observed only Grass in his edition of the *Jeu d'Adam* (e.g. Note to ll. 444, 637) and the present editor[2] in the *Anglo-French Life of St Osith* have used this criterion; Grass' text is less archaic than our poem and only some 80 per cent. of the lines show medial cesura. I have thought it right to use this criterion in a number of instances, e.g. l. 486 where *Quar granz vertuz est pacience* suited the rhythm better than the reading of A, although *de pacience* is syntactically preferable (cf. l. 744). In l. 249 too I preferred to correct the reading of O to *Itant*...rather than accept that of A; further in l. 792 for the sake of the rhythm I have changed the word order in O—*Ki t'anrme en enfer atent* into *Ki en enfer t'anrme atent*, despite the resulting hiatus (cf. § 55). In line 785 where in O the line was wanting I have felt able to suggest *en sa posteit*. The frequency of the preposition *enz en* before *la croiz* (cf. § 25) is doubtless due to the fact that the poet can thereby conveniently fill the hemistich. For the following lines, 275, 630, 654, 678, 701, 778, rhythm decided for the reading of O against a different reading in A. That the copyist of A disliked or disregarded this rhythm may be exemplified by the variants of lines such as 537.

[1] The version of the life of St Juliane in the MS. Canonici 74 contains some 88 per cent. of lines with medial cesura, while the other saint's life in the same MS.—that of St Mary of Egypt—has some 80 per cent. I have an edition of this last life in preparation. It is only right to add that for a number of years I have worked sporadically at this question and have examined some 30,000 lines, and I can state that for Anglo-French didactic literature the cesura is very common and seems to be a recognised characteristic.

[2] *Modern Language Review*, 1911–12.

§ 66. So far as the counting of syllables is concerned, there is little to remark. In MS. O *cristïen* is dissyllabic in the lines 326, 411, 906, and only in the two first lines is it corrected in A to *cristïens* ; on the other hand *cristïene* (l. 905) stands in both MSS. Both MSS. have *crestïens* and *crestïentet*, ll. 185, 181. In the lines 389, 503, 801 *terriens* is dissyllabic and is only corrected by A in the first case ; it is clear from the rhythm that the poet wished it to be dissyllabic ; *ancienement* 103 counts as four syllables in both MSS. (cf. Tobler, *Versbau*, 5th edition, p. 83).

La Vie Saint Andrier l'Apostle.

f° 120 v°
Une raison dire vos vulh,
Tot simplement et senz orguilh ;
Tuit escolteiz qui estes sage,
Ki Deu ameiz de vrai corage.
Ju ai sovent traitiet d'amur,
De joie grant et de dolzor,
De vaniteit et de folie,
De gas, de ris, de legerie.
Ai foliiet en ma jovente ;
En autre liu or ai m'entente.
Cant jovenes fui teil chose fis
Et mon penseir en teil liu mis
Dont moi repent et vul retraire,
Car teil chose est a Deu contraire.
Cant a ses jors est l'om venuz,
Garde soi bien ne soit perduz ;
Car, ce dist Deus, qui toz nos fist,
Et qui la vie el cors nos mist :
La u li hom serat troveiz,
Serat il salz u condemneiz.
Qui vult avoir Deu compangnie
Esvoillet soi, ne dormet mie.
Trop longement dormit avons
Es granz pechiez que faiz avons ;
Mais ce sachiez par veritet :
S'es granz pechiez astons troveit,
Senz amendise et senz pennance,
Perdut serons tot senz dotance.
Deus est mult fors et justes hom,
Forment soi vengniet del felon,
Mais ses cuers est plains de pietet
f° 121 r°
Et de mercit et de bontet.
Nulz hom n'avrat ja tant forfait
Encontre lui de son mesfait,
Proie mercit, que ne li facet,
Tant solement lo pechet hacet.
Mais nos cuers est plains de durece,
De grant tenebre et de perece.
Sa granz pitiez nos at conclus
Et aresteiz et convencuz.
Mais cant venrat faire justise
Al derrain jor de son juïse,
Quele ochison porons troveir
De nos pechiez a escuser ?
Dont seront tuit manifestet
Nostre mesfait et deviset.
Richise, onors, beateiz, largece,
Ors ne argenz, savoirs, prouece,
Parages granz, pere ne mere,
Cusins, amis, ne suer ne frere
Ne nos poront aidier de rien,
Se ne l'avons servit mult bien.
Or pensons dont tuit del bien faire,
Al mal soions toz jors contraire.
Deus est verteiz, verteit dirai,
Pur nule rien n'en mentirai ;
Mut nos est pres jors de venjance,
Amendons nos, faisons pennance.
Deus soi venget des anemis,
Ki es pechiez granz seront pris.
Nos qui vivons en ceste terre,
Quidons par voir tuit Deu conquerre
Par bien boire et par bien mangier,
Et par noz chars a delitier.
Mais ce sachiez par verité,
Ja ne verreiz la Deu clarté,
Se vos n'estes martrë el cors
U par dedenz u par defors ;

1 In MS. A the beginning reads:

Une raison dire volon,
Tote simple et de vrai sermon;
Tot l'entendes si seres sage,
Si le notes en vo corage.
En Deu amer a bone amor,
Por longhe joie et grant dolçor....

9 O *Ju ai foluet*, A *ai foloiet*, cf. § 42 (3). 14 A *Pour ce que Deu est a contraire.*
16 A *Gaite soi....* 17 A *por voir dist....* 20 A *s'est tot asaus u condampné.*
26 A *esties t.* In MS. A ll. 23, 24 come after 26 ; O seemed to me to offer the better reading.
33–34 Rime words from A. The copyist had omitted the riming word of line 33 and written *forfait* instead of *mesfait*.
45 *manifeste* without *t* in O. 47–8 Inverted in A.
55–6 *dira* : *mentira* in A. 59 A *Deus se vengera de ses....*
67 A *de cors*, cf. § 55.

Car ce sachies : doble maniere
Poomes nos soffrir martire,
U enz el cors u el corage,
Si cum le funt li home sage ;
En noz pensers martre serons,
Se bien et mal enguel soffrons,
Si cum richise et povreté,
Dolor del cors comme santé ;
Noz maldisanz beneïssons ;
f° 121 v° Qui mal nos font, bien lor faisons ;
Lo grant flael et lo torment
Ke Deus tremet sor nos sovent,
De granz arsins et de chir tens,
De trop plovoir et de gries venz,
De guerre grant, de pestilence,
Soffrons lo tot en pacience.
Soions loial, disons verteit,
Casteit amons et cariteit ;
Soit en noz cuers humiliteiz,
Dilections et pietez ;
Ostons de nos la tricherie
Et falseteit et boiserie ;
Nostre voisin ne devïons,
Nostre frere ne deparlons ;
Car ce dist Deus : qui dampnera
Son proeme, condempneiz sera.
Altrui honor, altrui richise
Ne desirons par convoitise ;
Ostons del cuer haenge, envide
Adulterë et homecide.
Ce ke Deus heit, de cuer haons,
Ce qu'il aimet, trestuit amons.
S'ensi vivons tuit vraement,
Martre serons spiritalment ;
Car li saint homme ancienement
Furent martiriet doblement :
En lur penseir promierement,
Puis en apres corporalment.
Li un furent encharteret,
Destroit loiet et afamet ;
Alcant furent detraïnet,
D'espeie ocis et demembret.
Li un furent par mi soiet
Et li pluisor em meir noiet :
Alcant furent mis en prison
Et vif rostit sor le charbon ;
Li un furent vif escorciet
Et tormenteit et decaciet ;
Alcant batut et flaeleit,
En croiz pendut et tormenteit ;
Si comme fut li pius Andrius
En cui honor est ciz traitiers.
Escrire vul sa passion,
Ja fait l'en ai devotion
Por qu'il mercit a Deu me facet
Del grant pechiet qui moi enlacet.
Ses chapelains pechieres sui ;
f° 122 r° Onorer vul et Deu et lui,
Et la pie sainte Marie,
Et de toz sainz la companie ;
Ja me sui mis en sa baillie,
Et sel commence a Deu aïe.
Cant Deus del ciel fut descenduz,
Et noz freres fut devenuz,
Ne guerpit pas ce qu'il astoit,
Mais ce prist il qu'il non avoit.
Mult abaissat sa seinorie,
Cant por nos vint en ceste vie ;
Vestit nostre humaniteit ;
Par sa grande umiliteit ;
Ki tot creat fut creature,
Cant il ot pris nostre nature,
Dedenz sa char sa deiteiz
S'atapissoit et sa posteiz ;

69 *martre* is perhaps *martré*, here and in l. 73. O *savez*. I have not seen this form elsewhere as imperative.

69–70 Read in A *Car ce sacies doble martire, Nos fera soffrir nostre sire*, cf. §§ 7 and 64.

74 A *engal*: in place of these forms Godefroy (s.v. *ivel*) has only *eugal* and *euguel*; the forms with *en-* do not seem certain.

81 A *De grant anui et....*

91–2 O *deivions*, cf. § 48 (3) Note; A *deparlons* : *dedaignons*. I take *devïons* as from *desvoiier* = lead not astray!

97–8 O *envie* : *homecide*; A *haine* : *homecide*; since *envide* (as well as *envie*) occurs in the *Dialoge Gregoire* (p. 369, 16), the language of which shows elsewhere a certain similarity with our poem, I have not hesitated to introduce this form, cf. § 55.

101 Cf. § 41. 107 Cf. § 15, B iii. 109 A *si furent tués*.

111 Cf. Epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 37.

119 The copyist writes in the body of the line: *Andrius*, *Andriu*, e.g. 161 176 211 533 839 888; *Andriers* 463 877 908 and *Andreas* 187; in the rime *Andrius* : *traitiers* 120 : *promiers* 146 : *crucefigier* 644; *Andrier* : *loier* 454 : *quiers* 774; *Andreas* : *Judas* 253 : *as* 313 : *Egeas* 418; cf. § 7, i.

120 A *traities*, cf. § 57. 125 A *serjans*, cf. Introd., Note 7.

130 A *ens el commens a Deu congié*. 134 A *qu'en mon estoit*.

137–8 These incorrect lines are wanting in A; since they may well be only a gloss, I have made no attempt to emend them.

142 A omits *et* and writes *poesté*, cf. § 15.

A soi atraist la simple gent
Ses doctrinat mut dulcement.
Des doze apostles li promiers
Fut apeleiz li pius Amdrius ;
Pierron son frere i amenat,
Deus les reciut, ses doctrinat,
Puis les vochat fors de la meir
Ses comenzat a sermoneir ;
Et il guerpirent grant richise
Ki despitarent convoitise.
Cant vint apres sa passion
Et sa beneoite assention,
Noz sires Deu le[s] devisat,
Et sermoner les comandat
A tote humaine creature
Ke la genz soit de lui segure,
Ki vraiement en Deu creroit
Et baptistere recivroit.
La voie Andriu est deviseie
In Achaiam cele contreie,
La doctrinat petiz et granz
Et convertit les mescreanz ;
Puis a Mirdone s'en turnat
Et Matheum renluminat ;
La fut batuz et traïneiz
Par les rues de la citeit.
Quarante mors resuscitat
Et convertit et baptizat ;
Enfers sanat, muz fist perleir,
Surs fist oïr, contraiz aleir.
Nuz hom n'astoit tant apresseiz
D'enferteit grant, ne fust saneiz,
f° 122 v° Proiast mercit tant solement
Al piu Andriu devotement.
Cant il ot fait les granz vertuz,
Dedenz Patras en est venuz,
Et Egeas li fel cruez
En la citeit astoit entreiz ;
Crestienteit volt abaissier
Et destruirë et avilhier,
Puis ses idles faire aoreir
Et ensalcier et honorer.
Volt crestiens a soi atraire
Et destruire lo sien contraire.
Mais Andreas l'at encontreit,
Et senz poür araisonet :
'Tu ki sires es posteïs,
'Justicieres d'icest païs,
'Conoistre dois ton creatur
'De cui part as si grant honur ;
'Jhesum Cristum dois aoreir
'Sor tote rien, sel dois ameir,
'Retraire dois ton fol corage,
'Les mescreanz de ton linage,
'De ceste fole mescreance,
'De tes faz deus u as fiance,
'Ki d'alcun fust sunt enformeit,
'D'or u d'argent encoloreit.'
'Es tu Andrius ?' dist Egeas,
'Qui noz temples desoleiz as ?
'Nostre lois est par toi perdue,
'Ki bone astoit et bien tenue ;
'Tu fais a toi lo pople entendre,
'Novele loi les vuls aprendre,
'Ne sai queles religions ;
'A Rome en fut ja mentions ;
'Par les princes de la contreie
'Destruite fut et condampneie.'
Andrius respont : 'Tuit li sanior,
'Qui a Rome tinent onor,
'La veriteit n'entendent mie,
'Comment Jhesus li fiz Marie
'En terre vint pecheors salveir
'Et del diable delivreir.
'Il nos aprist ses veriteiz
'Ke cist idle sunt falsetez ;
'Diables [est] en eaz mananz
'Et si dezoit les mescreanz ;
'Tant les maintient en son servise
'Ke soit del cors l'anrme devise ;
f° 123 r° 'Dolente en vait et en tristor
'Et en torment et en error,
'Dedenz enfer serat jamais,
'Puis n'atendra ne fin ne pais.'
Dist Egeas : 'Ceste parole,
'Ke tu moi dis, vaine est et fole ;
'Cant la nunzat vostre Jhesus
'As Judeus, fut en croiz penduz.'
Li pius apostles cant l'oït
De Deu parleir, si respondit :
'Oi, escoltеir se me volois,
'Lo sacrament de sainte croiz,
'Nostre Jhesus cum bonement
'Enz en la croiz sofrit torment ;
'Mort i reciut et passion,
'Tot por nostre redemption ;

147 O *i* wanting.
150 A *ses comandat a sermoner.*
151–74 Wanting in A; a miniature and 24 lines have been cut out; MS. A has been greatly mutilated.
156 *sermoner a*, cf. § 57.
165 *Mirdone*, v. Introduction A, Note 9.
167 Cf. § 62.
174 MS. *fist.*
182 A *Et d. et essillier*, cf. § 55.
184 A *Et encliner et h.*
185 A *les c...traire*, cf. § 8.
185–6 Inverted in A.
189 A *poestis.*
192 A *de qui tu as....*
194 A *le dois amer.*
201–226 Wanting in A, see above, 151.
229 A *Quant le noncha....*
230 A *As juis.*
236 For this use see §§ 25 and 65.

'Ce soffrit il tot de son greit,
'Et par sa bone volonteit.'
'N'est pas verteiz': dist Egeas,
'Car ton maistre traït Judas,
'Ki ses amis privez astoit
'Et jor et nuit ot lui manjoit;
'Il lo vendit trente deniers
'As Jius qu'il ot ameiz promiers.
'Cil lo misent al justezor
'Viltosement a desonor;
'Itant dissent et tant criarent
'K'en croiz ton Deu crucefiarent;
'Et tu disois ke bonement
'Soffrit tes Deus en crois torment.'
'La seoi ge': dist Andreas,
'U lo traït li fel Judas;
'Mais il nos dist par veriteit
'K'enz en la croiz seroit peneiz,
'Et al tierz jor resuscitroit,
'A ses amis aparistroit;
'Et mes freres Pierres li dist:
'"Maistres, aies de toi mercit,
'Ne rezoi mort ne passion,
'Z'astroit nostre confusion(s)."
'Et il li dist: "fui Satanas;
'Ce ke je di, n'entens tu pas,
'Car se tu bien moi entendoies
'Iteil parole ne diroies."
'Noz maistres puis nos demostrat
'Tot plainement et devisat:
$^{f^0 123}_{v^0}$ '"Ju ai postet, a mon plaisir,
'Et de vivrë et de morir;
'M'anrme prendrai cant je voldrai,
'Et a mun vul la reprendrai."
'Ensemble nos al soir cenat,
'Dist: "Un de vos moi traïstrat,"
'Dont fumes nos tot desturbeit,
'Forment dolant et trespenseit.
'Nos demandons qui ce seroit
'Ki traïson si grant feroit;
'Et il moi dist: "cil qui serat
'Ensemble moi et mangerat;
'Ja a penset la felonie
'Qu'il traïstrat lo fil Marie."
'Puis prist lo pain sel beneït
'Et sel brisat, puis si nos dist:
'"Mangiez cest pain, ce est mes cors
'Ki par vos iert livreiz a mort;
'Totens cant (vos) cest pain mangerez
'Ma passion renovereiz."
'Puis prist lo vin si lo seniat,
'Graces rendit sel nos donat:
'"Ki vraiement en moi creez,
'Ze est mes sans, tuit en beveiz;
'Demain por vos iert espanduz,
'Et li miens cors en croiz penduz."
'Cant ot doneit lo sacreit pain
'De la sue benoite main
'A un des nostres companions,
'Par cui faite est la traïsons,
'Dont nos aprist ke de son greit
'Et par sa bone volenteit,
'Et por nostre redemption
'Mort recivroit e passion;
'Son traïtor n'esloniat mie
'Ne des Juez la companie.'
Dist Egeas: 'En mun curage
'Toi sospezoi estre mut sage;
'Mais tu maintiens une folie
'Del fil ne sai quele Marie;
'Comment que soit que fut dampneiz
'En crois penduz et tormenteiz,
'Teil home dois bien resembleir
'Et ensalcier et onorer.'
$^{f^0 124}_{r^0}$ 'Or as bien fait': dist Andreas;
'Tant de ma part retenu as;
'Misteres granz est de la crois;
'Mais entendre se moi volois
'Je toi diroi mut bonement

243–6 Wanting in A.
247 Instead of *lo m.* A has *entresait*; the lines 247–50 form one single sentence.
249 O *tant dissent*, A *t. d. et itant c.* On account of the rhythm I have brought *itant* into the first hemistich; cf. § 65.
251 A *Et tu me dis.* 253 Cf. § 19.
255 *veriteit* should perhaps be altered to *veriteiz*, cf. § 23.
260 A *sire de toi a. m.* 261 Cf. § 62. 262 A *confusion.*
269 A *J'ai poesté.* 270 Cf. § 56. 273 A *ensemble o nos.*
275 A *Dont fumes mult desesperé*, cf. § 52 (2).
279–80 A twice *nos* instead of *moi.* O seems to me to translate more closely the Latin: *cui dedero panis fragmentum de manu mea.*
283 The poet follows the words of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, which are used at the Communion, rather than the words of the Evangelist.
285 A *c'est mes sainz cors.*
287 For unstressed vowels cf. § 15; in A we find *Tantost cest pain quant mangeres.*
292 Hiatus in both MSS., cf. § 56. 300 A *Et par s'esponge volenté.*
303 A *n'en longa mie*; the Latin text has: *nec traditorem fugiendo deseruit.*
304 A *Juïs.* 308 A *Del fil qui fu nes de M.* 311 A *En tel...senbler.*
313 A *b. dit.* 316 A *se vos voleis*; for *volois* cf. § 15. 317 A *Jou te dirai.*

'De sainte crois lo sacrament.'
Dont respondit li mescreanz :
'La crois n'est pas misteres granz,
'Mais est vilteiz, blames, dolors,
'Et reproviers et desonors.'
Andrius respont : 'Se moi entendre
'Vuls bonement, poras aprendre
'Ke la crois est granz sacramenz,
'Et des crestiens vrais salvamenz.'
Egeas dist : 'J'escolterai,
'Et ta raison entenderai ;
'Mais par lo Deu en cui je croi,
'S'a mon plaisir n'escoltes moi,
'Enz en la croiz te frai poseir
'Viltosement et tormenteir.'
Li pius apostles respondit :
'Merveilles granz or as tu dit ;
'Se lo torment de crois cremoi,
'Sa glore ja n'anunceroi.'
Dist Egeas : 'Tote esderveie
'Ta parole est ; n'est pas seneie ;
'Tu dis ke mors et gries tormenz
'Granz repos est et salvemenz ;
'Par la baldor qui est en toi,
'Ne redotes mon Deu ne moi.'
Andrius respont : 'Non par baldor,
'Mais par la foid et par l'amor
'Ke j'ai en Deu mon creatur
'De mort sofrir non ai pöor.
'Mors de juste home est gloriose,
'Mors del pechor est dolerose,
'Et par itant te vul aprenre,
'Se tu volois a moi entendre,
'De sainte croiz lo sacrament
'Ke tu creïsses vraiement ;
'Et puis seroit de mort livreie
'La tue anrme qui est dampneie.'
Li mescreanz at respondut :
'Puet estre salf ce k'est perdut ?
$^{f^o\,124}_{v^o}$ 'Se la moie anrmë est perdue
'Et condampneie et confondue,
'Poroit ele estre ja salveie
'Por ceste foi et restoreie ?'
'C'est mes desiers' : respont Andrius :
'Mais je t'aurai mostreit promiers
'Comment les anrmes sunt perdues,
'Et en enfer sunt deschendues,
'Puis par la crois sunt rachateies
'Et del diable delivreies.
'Noz promerains peres Adams
'En paradis astoit mananz ;
'Mut large astoit sa commandise
'Mais tot perdit par convoitise ;
'Car par lo fruit del fust dampnant
'Fut condampneiz a parmanant ;
'Lo Deu commant ne gardat mie,
'Por ce perdit sa seniorie ;
'Tuit cil qui sunt de son linage,
'Ancor i ont granior damage ;
'Nos fumes tuit par fust dampneit,
'Et par un fust sumes salveit.
'Cil qui promiers a sa figure
'Format Adam de terre pure,
'Naistre deniat de pure femme,
'Ki de casteit est clere gemme.
'Adam simples od sa mollier
'Soi delitat del pum mangier.
'Enz en la crois li pius Jhesus
'Por les pecheors fut penduz ;
'Boivres ameirs li fut donez,
'Fiez et aisiz en un mellez ;
'Nus hom terreins ki ainc fuist neiz
'A si grant tort ne fut dampneiz.'
Dist Egeas : 'Iteil parole
'Dois raconteir a la gent fole
'Ki sunt de ta religion
'Et qui croient ton vain sermon ;
'Mais je te di par verité
'Se tu ne fais ma volenté,
'Et s'a mon Deu ne vus servir
$^{f^o\,125}_{r^o}$ 'Enz en la crois te frai morir.'
Andrius respont mut bonement :

324 A *Loiauté grant i pues a.*
326 A *des c.*, cf. § 66.
327 A *Jou aprendrai.*
328 A *escolterai.*
328 For *entenderai* cf. § 15.
331 A *En la crois te ferai*, cf. § 15.
335–6 A *cremoie* : *anoncereie*, cf. § 15.
336 For this orthography cf. § 38 (4).
344 *foid*, cf. § 49 (4).
349 MS. *apenre.* 352 A *se voloies.* 357 Hiatus in both MSS., cf. § 55.
360 O *crois*, A *foi* ; *fides* or πίστις in the Latin or Greek texts.
361 A *desirs*, cf. § 9.
371 A *dampnant*, O *vivant* ; neither A nor O translate exactly the text (*lignum praevaricationis, ξύλον παραβάσεως*) ; in the passage of the First Epistle to Timothy it reads in the Vulgate: *mulier autem seducta in praevaricatione fuit* (1 Tim. ii. 14).
380 A *dure* ; the repetition of *pure* is however correct (*et quoniam de inmaculata terra factus fuerat homo primus...necessario de inmaculata virgine natus perfectus homo*).
382 A *Qui de clarté est flors et gemme.*
383–4 A *A. s. del pum manger, Se delita et s. m.*, cf. § 57.
389 A *Hom t.*, cf. § 8.
394 O *Bien croient....*
398 A *Jou te ferai en c. m.*, cf. § 65.

'Je serf a Deu devotement,
'A cel sanior ki est poissanz,
'Uns vrais Deus est et parmananz,
'Cascun jor faz lo sien servise
'Et en l'auteir lo sacrefise;
'Ja n'offerrai a mon Deu feste
'Char de multon ne sanc de beste;
'Lo fun d'encens ja n'offerrai,
'Mais l'anieal piu sacrefierai;
'Et bien est droiz ke je ce face,
'Blans est cum noiz et s'est senz tache;
'Li vrai crestien qui simplement
'Croient en Deu omnipotent,
'Cant ont la char d'icel angnieal
'Mangiet et biut lo sanc noveal,
'Ades en ciel cil angneax blans
'Entiers serat et parmananz.'
'Di moi coment': dist Egeas.
'Se tu volois,' dist Andreas,
'La forme del desciple prenre,
'Tu lo porrois mut bien aprenre.'
Dist Egeas: 'tant toi batrai,
'Tant durement toi tormentrai
'Ke je saurai la devisance
'D'icest sermon e conissance.'
Respont Andrius: 'Pöor non ai,
'Mais en mon cuer grant mervelle ai;
'Tes cuers est toz plains de folie
'Qui al secle as grant seniorie;
'Mut par es fos, qui par torment
'Vuls aprehdre tel sacrament;
'Tu as oït, mais tu nel crois,
'Lo sacrament de sainte crois.
'Lo sacrament del sacrefice,
'Si cum om fait al Deu servise,
'S'en Jhesu Crist croire volois,
'Qui fut peneiz enz en la crois,
'K'il soit vrais Deus de grant poissance,
'Jel t'aprendrai senz demorance.'
Dist Egeas: 'tu m'aprendras,
'Et par ordene tu moi diras;
f° 125 v° 'Tuit li crestien qui vraiement
'Croient en Deu omnipotent,
'Cant ont la char d'icel angnieal
'Mangiet et biut lo sanc noveal,
'En ciel ades cil angnieax blans
'Entiers serat et parmananz.'
'De tot ton cuer,' respont Andrius,
'En mon sanior creras promiers;
'Mais se nel fais, ja nel sauras,
'Ja veriteit n'en conistras.'
Egeas est forment irez
D'icest conseil et trespensez
Et comandat lo piu Andrier
En sa chartre destroit loier.
Quant es tenebres fut enclos,
Tote la nuit nen ot repos,
Car cele gent de la contreie
Devant la chartre est assembleie.
Grant frinte i ot, tencë et ire,
Tuit Egeam vulent ocire,
Et puis la chartre deserreir,
Et lo saint home delivreir.

400 O *ser*; *servir* with *à* is not quoted in Soltmann (cf. § 57) but it occurs in the *Quatre Livres des Rois*: *a deable servir*, pub. Le Roux de Lincy, p. 302 and Curtius, p. 152, and in Godefroy, supp.

407 A *ja ne ferai*.

408 A *aignel Dieu*; in the sources the reading is: *sed inmaculatum agnum cotidie in altare crucis sacrifico*; since ll. 409–10 translate *inmaculatum*, it is not clear which reading is to be preferred.

411 A *Vrai c.*, cf. l. 326.

411–16 After the above quotation comes: *cujus carnes posteaquam omnis populus credentium manducaverit et ejus sanguinem biberit, agnus qui sacrificatus est integer perseverat et vivus....*

420 A *porroies bien...*; cf. § 15.

422 Both MSS. have this form of the future, cf. §§ 15, 29.

423–4 Rime words inverted in A; in the second Greek text printed by Bonnet the reading is: Ἐγώ σε τοῖς βασανισμοῖς ἀπαιτήσω χάριν τῆς τοιαύτης γνώσεως. O seemed therefore to give the better word order.

432–33 A *mistere*; thus in O twice *sacrament*; the copyist of O has therefore made no slip; in all the texts *mysterium* stands twice; in Lactantius *mysterium* and *sacramentum* have the same meaning.

440 A *Et par ordre tu me diras.*

441 Cf. note to l. 326.

444 O *biet.*

445 A *Ades en ciel....*

447–50 *Si credideris ex toto corde tuo, discere poteris; si non credideris, penitus numquam tu ad indaginem hujus veritatis adtinges.*

449 A *crois.*

452 A *sermon.*

454 A *Ens en s. ch. estroit*; so always in MS. A with one exception.

459 A *Grant tence i ot et grant ire*; thus Hiatus in both MSS., cf. § 55.

460 A *T. veulent E. o.* For the importance of the word order in O, cf. § 64.

461 A *desfermer.*

Mais sainz Andriers les comfortat
Et dulcement apaisentat :
'Enssi,' fait il, 'ne serat mie ;
'Laisseiz esteir ceste folie ;
'Cant Jhesus fut pris et traïz,
'Decrachiez fut et escherniz ;
'Ses beles mains viltosement
'Löies ot destroitement ;
'Si cum lerres qui est dampneiz,
'Fut par la rue commeneiz ;
'A la colombe fut loiez
'Qui fait non ot unkes pechiez ;
'Cil en son chief spines portat
'Qui noz chies est et nos salvat ;
'Entre larrons pendit en crois
'Cil qui eret sires et rois ;
'Noz Deus soffrit si grant torment
'Por l'amende de male gent ;
'Et des Judeus ne quist venjance,
'Car en son cuer ot grant soffrance.
Cant li halz rois humiliment
'Tot ce soffrit senz maltalent,
'Aiez trestuit pais et silence,
'Quar granz vertuz est pacience.
'Ne desturbez lo mien martire
[fo 126 ro] 'Ke je de cuer aime et desire ;
'N'aez paur de soffrir mort,
'Soiez del cuer hardit et fort ;
'Car qui por Deu soffrit torment
'En ciel vivrat parmanamment.
'Por les dolors de ceste vie
'Poeiz avoir Deu companie ;
'Se cez dolors sunt a cremir
'Que cascun jor poeiz sofrir,
'Celes d'enfer orribles sunt
'Ki jamais fin ne prenderunt ;
'Mais la päur et la menace
'De ceste gent ke Deus ne hace,
'Plus tost trevait cum la fumeie
'Qui tost perist, cant ele est neie.
'Terriens onors, terriens tormenz
'Trespasset tost cumme li venz ;
'Mais cil d'enfer durrat jamais,
'Ja n'i a aurat ne fin ne pais ;
'En enfer est si granz dolors,
'Strendors de denz, sospirs et plurs,
'Horribles criz, de granz ardurs,
'Travalz, tenebres et froidurs,
'Nuz cuers ne puet aporpenseir,
'Ne lengue d'ome deviseir ;
'Et Egeas de ce n'at cure,
'Al secle mal trop s'asegure ;
Mais vos qui estes vrai creant
'Teneiz voz cuers a Deu lo grant ;
'Mort ne cremeiz ne passion
'Ke vos facent soffrir felon ;
'Car senz falle par ceste voie
'Conquerreiz tuit la grande joie.
'Florit sereiz li Deu amis
'Et coroneit en paradis,
'Mais ne sentrez ne chalt ne froit,
'Dolor ne mal ne faim ne soit.
'Ades verres en grant posteit
'Lo halt sanior et en clarteit ;
'Semblant sereiz az sainz archangles,
'Senz fin vivreiz cume li angle.
'Or vos penez de ce conquerre,
[fo 126 vo] 'Tant cum estes vivant sor terre,
'Et si penseiz de l'esploitier,
'Car li tens est bons por voilier.'
Cant Andrius ot dit teil parole,
Tote nuit ot tenue escole
Et ot la gent bien doctrineíe.
Clere se fut la matineie ;
Egeas s'est par main leveiz,
En sun palais s'en est monteiz ;
El siege sist de pestilence,
Andriu mandat en sa presence,

465 A *sera*, O *serait*, but not clear.

468 A *Decachies...escopis*. The poet follows the narrative in St Mark's Gospel: *et conspuebant eum...et...illuserunt eum* (xv. 19, 20). In the *Passion*, *illuserunt eum* is turned by *l'ont escarnit* (l. 253, Lücking).

470 A *loies*. 478 A *estoit*. 480 A *Par l'envie d. m. g.*

481 A *des juis ne fist onques v.*, cf. § 14.

486 A *car vertus est de p.*, cf. § 65.

492 A *permanalment*, cf. § 57. 498 *prenderunt* in both MSS., cf. § 58 (11).

501 A *en vait* instead of *trevait* (=*evanescit*).

502 A *quant est levee* (=*cum excitatus fuerit*). 503 Cf. § 8.

508 A *Genror souspir et plor dedens*; cf. § 57.

511–2. Both MSS. have *a porpenseir* : *a deviseir*; I have emended, since, so far as I know, *pooir à* never occurs; cf. *Poème moral*, note to 150 d.

516 A *T. v. ferm a....* 521 Cf. § 68.

523 A *souffres ne fain ne soit*, for *sentrez* cf. § 29. 524 O *soi*, A *soit*.

525 A *en poestey*, cf. § 15. 528 A *comme les angles*, cf. § 21.

531 A *Et si penes*. 537 A; O has *Par main est Egeas levez*.

539 Thus in both MSS. This would appear to be an allusion to: *Beatus vir, qui...in cathedra pestilentiae non sedit*; in the Oxford Psalter this is turned by: *Beneurez li huem chi...en la chaere de pestilence ne sist* (Ps. i. 1). In the sense of 'tribunal' the expression is found in the story of the crucifixion ascribed to Joseph of Arimathea (cap. ii fin.).

Puis si li dist: 'J'avoi penset
'Ke tu querrois conseil senet,
'Et cesserois de ta folie
'Et guerpirois lo fil Marie,
'Et a noz deus ferois servise
'Si conquerrois joie et richise.
'N'est pas savoirs, mais grant folie
'Perdre la joie en ceste vie;
'Ki sa mort quiert u passion,
'Ce m'est avis qu'il soit bricons.
'Croi mon conseil, prout i auras;
'Repaire a nos, si gaineras.'
Andrius respont: 'Joie aurai grant
'Ensemble toi a parmanant,
'Se tes fals deus vulz relenkir
'Et a mon Deu de cuer servir.
'J'ai paraleit ceste contreie,
'Et mainte gent a Deu torneie.'
Dist Egeas: 'Por ce voldroi
'Toi returneir a nostre loi,
'Ke ceste genz et simple et fole,
'Qui deceute est par ta parole,
'De cest jor mais ne fust acline
'A falseteit de ta doctrine,
'Mais repairast a nostre loi,
'Creïssent tuit ce ke ge croi.
'En cest païs nen at citeit
'U ne soient deu desoleit,
'Temple destruit et conbrisiet
'Par ton sermon et avilhiet;
'Or les covient raparilhier
'Par ton conseil et ensalcier.
'Nostre Deu sunt vers toi iriet;
f° 127 r° 'Reconquier tost lur amistiet,
'Si conquerras la nostre amor,
'Ensemble nos auras honor.
'Ce ke j'ai dit, se tu nel fais,
'Noz vrais amis ne seras mais;
'Mais granz tormenz te frai soffrir,
'Puis en la crois pendre et morir.'
Li pius apostles respondit:
'Messages sui de Jesu Crist;
'Oi, fiz de mort, escolte moi,
'Uimais n'aurai mercit de toi;
'J'avoi penseit ke par dulçor
'Te froi guerpir la grant error
'U enz tu es e destruirois
'Toz les falz deus u enz tu crois.
'Or voi ge bien ke tes corages
'Mescreanz est, n'est mie sages.
'Cure non ai de tes menaces,
'Ne de torment ke tu me faces;
'En ton penseir engarde bien,
'Ne m'esparnier de nule rien,
'Mais les plus gries et les majors
'Ke faire pues et doleros,
'Fai les por Deu hastivement,
'Jes sofferrai mut bonement;
'Car tant serai plus conjoiz
'Devant mon Deu en paradis,
'Ke plus aurai par sue amur
'Soffert de mal et de dolor.'
Egeas plus ne pot soffrir,
Ses serjanz fist a soi venir,
Sel commandat a flaeleir,
Destroitement a tormenteir;
Et li sainz hom devotement
Soffrit en soi lo grief torment.
Tant l'ont plaiet et tant batut
Ke vint et uit en sunt vencut.
Cant sainz Andrius al roi felon
Fut ameneiz, mist l'a raison:
'Fai mon conseil': dist Egeas:
'Et escapeir de mort poras;

541–6 In A in place of these forms of the impft. or condit. we find: *avoie, creïsses, consel, gerpiras, feras, conquerras*, cf. § 15 A.

548 A *Qui joie pert.*

550 A *...che sunt bricon*, cf. § 62.

556 *servir a* in both MSS.; cf. note to l. 400.

557 O *paraleie.*

559 A *voloi.*

562 A *que dechut as....*

565 A *repairent.*

568 *U tu n'as mes deus defolé* (=*nulla enim remansit in Achaia civitas in qua non templa derelicta sint et deserta*).

579 A *t'estuet souffrir.* The scribe of A avoids all forms with omitted unstressed vowels; but see l. 559 and cf. § 15.

583–4 A has in the place of these lines, which are well supported by the sources: *Et de tout a lui jou m'otroi, M'arme commant al sovrain roi. Dist Egeas: fui t'en de chi, Huimais n'arai de toi merchi.* The other lines up to 602 are put into the mouth of Egeas.

585–6 A *J'avoie penseit par d. Metre de toi l. g. e.* The scribe of A again takes exception to forms such as *avoi, froi.*

588 A *en qui tu c.*

594 A *Ne mesprenge.*

595 A *grengnors* (in place of *majors*).

597 A *hardiement.*

606 A *estroitement.*

608 A *S. por Deu mult loaument.*

609 A *Tant l'ont batu...feru.*

610 O *vint et vint*, A xxv; in the sources the reading is: *septem terniones* or *quaterniones*; the poet had doubtless the latter reading before him.

612 O *mist la raison* over expunctuation; A *mis la raison En mon conseil...*; the Latin text reads: *Audi me Andreas et ab effusione tui sanguinis consilium revoca.*

'Mais si ne vuls a moi entendre,
'Enz en la crois te ferai pendre;
'La sofferas vitosement
f° 127 v° 'Jusk'a la mort paine et torment.'
Andrius respond: 'A cel sanior
'Servise fai et nuit et jor
'Ki en ciel est haltismes rois
'Et fut peneiz ens en la crois;
'Mais tu, chaitis, des granz dolors
'Et des tormenz et des gries plurs,
'Ki en enfer toi front ploreir,
'Segurement pues escapeir
'S'en Jhesu Crist voloies croire,
'Cant tu verras ma grant victore.
'La passion ke doi soffrir
'Dedenz mon cuer me fait joïr;
'Mais grant pöur ai de la mort
'Ke sofferas senz nul confort
'Dedenz enfer a parmanant
'U li pechor seront dolant.
'Ma passions tost finerat,
'Un jor u dous u trois durat;
'Pense, chaitis, ke li torment
'Et li dolors ki toi atent
'Par cent mil ans ne prendrat fin
'Ne jor ne nuit, soir ne matin.'
Egeas ot le cuer felon,
Mut dedenios de cest sermon,
Et comandat le piu Andriu
Isnelement crucefigier;
Puis comandat a sa maisnie
Iteil consel de felonie.
'Aleiz,' fait il, 'si le loiez
'De cordes granz et mainz et piez,
'Despolliez le et si gardeiz
'Ke clou de fer ja n'i metteiz;
'Car se de clous est trefichies,
'Tost finerat senz dolors gries;
'De cordes bien loiez pendrat
'Et dure fin ensi ferat.'
Li sainz hom est jugiez a mort,
Pris et loiez a mut grant tort;
Et li serjant hastivement
Si l'en mainent ver lo torment.
Tote la gent de la contreie
En grant irour est assembleie;
Vinent crestien a mut grant bruit
f° 128 r° A une voiz escrient tuit:
'Ke faites vos, ser del diable?
'Ke demandeis l'ome raisnable?
'Ke at mefait? ke poeiz dire?
'Por coi voleiz teil home ocire?
'Por ke il blamet vos pechiez
'Serat il dont crucefigiez?
'Ke fais tu, genz tote esderveie,
'Chaitive genz et despereie?
'Por koi destruis tu veriteit,
'Et ensalces la falseteit?'
'O bele gent,' fait sainz Andrius,
'Vos me faites granz desturbiers,
'Ne desturbeiz lo mien martyre
'Ke je del cuer aime et desire;
'Ma passion ne desturbeiz,
'De vos granz cris uimais cesseiz;
'Onkes nen öu, tot mon vivant,
'Dedenz mon cuer joie si grant
'Si cum ju ai ci en present;
'Ci finerunt tot mi torment.
'En paradis serat jamais
'L'anrme de moi en grande pais;
'Et vos penseiz de l'esploitier,
'Deus vos en puist trestoz aidier.'
Quant li sainz hom est parvenuz
La u stabliz eret li fuz,
Esgarde lonc, la croiz si vit,
Mut fut jouis et puis si dist:
'Saluee soies tu, preciose,
'Beneoite crois et gloriose,
'Ki del cors Deu fus honoree
'Et del benoit sanc aroseie;
'Des membres Deu santefiie
'Si cum d'itele margerie;
'Estre soloit pöürs en toi,
'Mais or es tu confors de moi.

630 A *en mon cuer me fait resjoir*, cf. § 65. 634 A *U pecheor*, cf. § 15.
636 *durat* in both MSS., cf. § 15.
638 A *e la dolor k'a toi apent*; for gender cf. l. 801. 649 A *Despoillies le.*
651–2 A *estoit ficies Tost fineroit ses dolors gries.*
654 A *Et puis dure fin souffera*, cf. § 65.
657–8 A *Et li sains hom hastivement Vait tous joious vers son torment*; O then has the better reading, since in the sources stands: *cumque eum carnifices ducerent.*
661 A *U crestien a m. g. b.*, cf. note to l. 326. 664 A *Que faites vos....*
665 A *que voles dire.* 670 A *c. g. desesperée.*
674 O *grant destorbier*, cf. § 57. 678 A *Huimais de v. g. c. cesses*, cf. § 65.
679 A *Onkes n'avoie en m. v.* 681 A *ore en p.*
684 A *De mon cors l'arme en boene pais*, cf. § 23 (*b*).
687 A *Quant li sains s'estoit porveus, La u stablis estoit li fus.*
691 A *Salue soies tu...*, cf. § 15. 692 A *et* is omitted, cf. § 15. 693 A *aoree.*
696 A *d'icele m.* The reading in both MSS. is quite clear but scarcely satisfactory; the passage reads: *Salue crux quae in corpore Christi dedicata es et ex membrorum ejus margaritis ornata.*

'Anz ke Jhesu en toi pendist
'Et par son vul mort recevist,
'Vilteiz astois et reproviers,
'Mais or es tu nos granz desiers.
'Promiers astois chose senestre,
'Or as en toi amur celeste.
f° 128 v° 'Se li crestien toi conissoient,
'De ta vertut grant joie auroient ;
'Par toi enfers fut despolhiez
'Et Satanas destroit loiez.
'Par ton conduit serat floris
'Des saintes armes paradis.
'Ge vieng a toi segurement,
'Or moi rezoif joiosement.
'Ge sui desciples d'icel roi
'Qui fut peneiz et mors en toi ;
'Ge sui toz jors tes vrais amis,
'Or moi conduis en paradis.
'Ma volenteit ai acomplie
'Cant de mes braz t'ai embracie ;
'Cant je toi tieng et je toi voi,
'Nule riens est qui falle a moi.
'Oi, bone croiz et mult ameie,
'Sor tote rien t'ai desireie.
'Oi, sainte croiz qui la beauteit
'Et la dulzor et la bonteit
'Des membres Deu as retenut,
'Or moi rezoif en ta vertut ;
'De tot mon cuer t'avoi ameie,
'Quise t'avoi si t'ai troveie.
'Oste mon cors de ceste vie,
'Et m'anrme rent al fil Marie.
'Mes maistres puis moi recevrat
'Qui par ton non me rachatat.'
Quant s'orisons fineie fut,
Li sainz son cors at devestut,
Et delivrat lezosement
As ministres son vestiment ;
Puis en la croiz est ensalciez
Et estenduz et travilhiez ;
De cordes est li cors loiez
Entur les jambes et les piez.
Qui dont veïst cùm piement
Li justes hom soffrit torment,
De lui eüst mut grant pitance,
Car grant vertuz est de soffrance.
Vint mili ome de present
Esgardoient sospirantment
Lo piu apostle confortant
f° 129 r° La gent de Deu et doctrinant,
Qu'il n'aient soing de mal soffrir,
Ne por l'amor de Deu morir.
La astoit uns mut riches om
Qui Stratocles avoit a nom,
Freres astoit del justezor,
Grant dol avoit del piu sanior
Ki la pendoit viltosement
Et non par juste jugement.
La genz qui erent enfreie
Ad Egeam s'en est aleie,
Et crient tuit a halte voiz
Ke senz forfait pendoit en croiz
Cil qui astoit justes et castes,
Humles et pius, sainz et raisnables,
Veritables maistres seneiz
De bones mors bien doctrineiz.
En croiz penez dos jors astoit,
La veriteit ne guerpissoit.
'Tormenteiz est trop longement,
'Metons lo jus isnelement.'
Egeas est mut desturbeiz
Et dist qu'il froit lur volenteiz.
A saint Andrier vient od la gent
Qui de cest fait erent dolent.
Cant l'out veu li pius Andriers,
Dist : 'Egeas, a nos que quiers ?

700 A *Et de son voloir mort i prist.*
702 A *Mais ore es tu grant desiriers.*
704 A *Mais en toi a....*
705 A *Se crestïen*, cf. § 326.
707 A *Infers fu par toi d.*, cf. § 65.
710 A *Mainte sainte arme en p.*
711 A *humiliment* ; in favour of O stands : *securus ergo et gaudens venio ad te, ita ut et tu exultans suscipias me discipulum ejus qui pependit in te, quia amator tuus semper fui et desideravi amplecti te.*
720 A *...faille en toi.*
725 A *receu* ; O seems to render the Latin text more closely while A translates the Greek better : *O bona crux quae decorem et pulcritudinem de membris domini suscepisti... ὦ μακάριε σταυρέ, ὁ μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ ὡραιότητα ἐκ τῶν μελῶν τοῦ κυρίου δεξάμενος....*
726 A *sa vertu.* The sources do not help to a decision.
728 A *Desirai toi...*, cf. § 15.
735 O *lezosement* = *leeçosement*, A *mult bonement.*
740 A *E. les bras, entur l. p.*
745 A *xxm. home tout en present.*
746 A *E. son finement.*
747–8 Otherwise in A : *Li pius apostles confortant Parla al peuple doucement, Dist : n'aies soing....*
751 A *La entendi uns rices hom.*
753 A *Freire estoit al justisëor*, cf. § 15.
756 A *Et nient....*
757 O *erent*, A *ierent*, *enfreie* stands doubtless for *enfriée*.
760 A *meffait pent en la crois.*
761 Cf. § 68.
770 A *Dist qu'il feroit....*
774 A *a moi que quiers ?* (= *Quid tu ad nos Aegeas venisti ?*)

'Se croire vus al creator
'Qui deniat naistre por pecheörs,
'Si cum je t'ai por voir promis,
'Ancor overs t'est paradis ;
'Mais se ci viens por enguardeir
'Et de la croiz me vus osteir,
'Tant cum vivant mon cors verras
'Osteir de ci ne me porras,
'Car je sui ja em paradis,
'Ja voi mon Deu od ses amis ;
'Ja voi mon Deu en sa posteit,
'Ja sui assis en sa clarteit,
'Ce que toz jors ai desireit,
'Ja l'ai conquis et bien trovet ;
'Ja sui venus en sa presence
'Ki lo munde at en providence.
'Mais grant dolor ai del torment
'Ki en enfer t'anrmë atent.
'Ai ! cum tu es foz et chaitis
[f° 129 v°] 'Ki pers la joie de paradis !
'Tant cum tu pues, quers la mercit,
'Plains de pitie est Jhesu Crist ;
'Dont iert trop tart cant ne porras
'Parleir, proier, car mors seras.
'La mors destruit en ceste vie,
'Richise, onor et seniorie ;
'Terrien dolor, force et bealtet.
'Mors n'esparniet neule postet.'
Or ne puent plus atargier
Del saint apostle desloier ;
Encontremont tendent lor mains,
Mais lur laburs folz est et vains.
Li uns sor l'autre vait muntant,
Del desloier unt desier grant ;
Mais il n'i at nul tant hardit,
Riche, povre, grant ne petit,
Ki lo saint home ost atochier
Ne les cordes puist desloier ;
A ceaz li braz enroidissoient
Qui vers la croiz lur mains tendoient.
Li sainz hom est mut turmenteiz,
Car en croiz est dos jors peneiz
Ki ainc ne biut ne ne manjat,
Ne de voir dire ne cessat ;
Mais ses pius olz a Deu levat,
A halte voiz si l'apelat :
'Ne soffre ja, haltismes rois,
'Osteir mon cors de ceste crois,
'S'acompliz n'as mes grans desiers
'Et rezeute m'anrme promiers ;
'Ne moi laisses ja departir
'De la joie que tant desir.
'Or en est tens, cant serai mors,
'Ke rezoivet terre mon cors.
'En paradis m'anrme serat,
'Senz nule fin en pais vivrat.'
Deus li complit sa volenteit ;
Si face il nos par sa bonteit !
Et celes ovres nos laist faire,
Ke tuit soions al mal contraire ;
[f° 130 r°] Ensemble lui nos doinst la vie
Jhesus Cristus, li fiz Marie.
Cant sainz Andrius ot paroreit,
Esguardent tuit une clarteit
Si cum l'esfoldre splendiant
Cant del halt ciel vint acheant ;
Trestot cel liu enluminat
Et lo saint cors avironat
Si que nuz hom nel pot veoir
En la clarteit ne parcivoir.
Cant ot esteit ore demeie
Et la clarteiz s'en est aleie,
Li benoiz spirs em paradis
Rezius en est et conjoïz
En la presence del sanior
Qui at posteit, glore et onor ;
Beiles soldeies seit doneir
Et de si granz rentes doueir
Li postis rois son chevalier
Ki l'ait servit en son desier ;
Guerre, dolor, n'aurat jamais ;
Senz nule fin vivrat en pais.

775 A *Se daignes croire.* 778 *Encore est o. p.*, cf. § 65.
783–4 A *jou* in place of *ja* (=*jam enim regem meum video*).
785 Wanting in O, *en poëstei* in A; cf. § 65.
792 O *Ki t'anrmè en enfer atent*, A *Qu'en enfer la toie arme atent*, cf. § 65.
794 A *Quant pers....* Thus too long in both MSS., cf. § 63 (7).
797 A *Dont iert trop tart*, O *Dont primes tart.*
801 A *Terrien solas, f. b.*, cf. § 66; the alteration seems due to the fact that A uses *dolor* in the fem., cf. l. 638. 808 A *desir*, cf. § 9.
811 A *Qui le s. osast aproismier.* 823 A *desirs.* 826 A *gloire.*
827 fol. The Latin texts take the matter rather differently, yet O stands nearer to the meaning (cf. *tempus enim est ut commendes* [*domine Jesu Christi*] *terrae corpus meum*).
828 A *...mes cors.* 831 A *enpli.* 833 A *Et iteus oevres n. l. f.*
838 A *Si voient....*
839 O *espoldre*, for *p* instead of *v* cf. l. 912; A *le foudre resplendant.*
840 A *...descendant.* 845 *fere dimidiae horae spatio*, cf. § 8.
850 A *Qui poesté a et honor.* 851 A *Teiles*, cf. § 34.
854 A *Qui l'a servi de cuer entier*; *ait*=*a* as in A.

Ki al diable fait servise
Comment ke soit, en quiue guise,
Al paraler mal gueredon
Atendre puet d'icel felon.
Car teil lowier ot Egeas
Qui sires fut dedenz Patras.
Anz qu'il venist a sa maison,
Ot de ses faits mal gueredon.
Devant la gent emmi la voie
De cest secle perdit la joie,
Car li malz spirs k'il ot servit
Teiles soldeies li rendit,
Il li entrat dedenz lo cors,
Tant lo destrainst qu'il chaït mors;
Et Stratocles lo cors benoit
Tant embrazat en cel destroit,
Ke de la mort est eschapeiz
Dont Egeas astoit dampneiz.
D'iteile mort Deus nos defendet,
Et en sa part noz anmes prendet;
Par saint Andrier defension
Et par sa dulce oration,
Ki est garde de cez citeiz
La u ses nons est apeleiz,
f° 180 v° Ki lo maintient en ramembrance
Ja ne cherrat en desperance.
Ki vait par meir, qui vait par terre
Por sustence de son cors querre
Soit ens en sa protection,
Ja non aurat confusion;
Car ce nos dist sainte escriture
De saint Andriu la gemme pure,
Ce est li sainz qui oret ades
Al creatur por noz esces,
Por la citeit et por la gent
Qui en pöur sunt et torment.
Il est mut pius et atendanz
Et merciables et soffranz,
De grasce plains et de bonteit,

Car nos pluisor l'avons troveit;
Soventes foiz avons socurs
De sue part et granz onurs.
Cant la chose est maniffesteie,
Grant pöur ot en la contreie.
Li mescreant sunt recrëut
Et baptistere ont recëut.
Maximilla, femme onereie
De la citeit astoit bien neie,
L'amur de Deu avoit en soi,
Et maintenoit crestiene loi;
Ele reciut lo benoit cors
De saint Andrier qui eret mors;
Soniosement l'enbalsemat
Et de pailes l'envolepat,
Si l'onorat mut haltement
Et sevelit devotement.
D'icele sainte sepulture
Vos racontrai grant aventure,
Ke Deus i fait par sa posteit
Et par l'apostle digniteit.
Mannë i surt par mut grant signe,
Ausi cum soit blanche farine.
La mostret Deus vertut mut grant
Por lo saint home cascon an:
Cant cil mannes surt a plenteit
Tot cel an ont fertiliteit;
f° 181 r° Cant pou en est, c'est desturbiers,
Car tot cel an est li tens chiers.
Tot ce fait Deus por ses amis
Qui conut sunt en paradis
Et bien ont fait sa comandise
Et maintenut lo sien servise.
La passions or est fineie.
Vos qui l'aveiz bien recordeie,
Prendre i poeiz exemple grant
Dont liet serez a parmanant.
Or proiez tot lo Deu amis
Qui riches est en paradis,

858 A *nule guise.* O has *quine*, cf. § 23.
867 A *Car maus espirs....*
871–2 Instead of these lines we find in A the following:

Et Stratocles le cors benoit — *Quant Stratocles a chou veu*
Grant paor ot quant il le voit; — *Egeas mort et confondu;*

in the Latin text we read: *frater* (sc. Stratocles) *vero tenens corpus sancti Andreae evasit.*
879 Reading of A. In O we have: *Ki est garde des esdelveiz*; the last word of which I do not understand.
885 A *Soit mis en.* 890 A *esches*, cf. § 57. 893 A *Il est mult prous....*
895 A *De g. p. et saintée.* 896 A *avons prové.*
899 *est* in both MSS.; should perhaps be altered to *ert.*
906 Thus also in A, where perhaps *Et* should be deleted, cf. note to l. 326.
908 A *Andrieu...estoit.*
910 A *envolepa*, O has only *envepat*; *envolepeiz* in the *Dialoge*, 315. 14.
912 O *sepelit.* 914 A *Vos conteron*, cf. beginning of MS. A.
915 A omits *i.* 917 Hiatus, cf. § 55.
920 In A the rime word is written *ant.* 923 *c'est* wanting in O.
930 A *escoutee.* 933 O *li Deu*; A *le Deu a.*
934 O *reche estes.*

Ke il noz cors en ceste vie
Puist si gardeir de vilonie
Ke les anmes soient salvees
En paradis et coroneies;
Cant ce venrat al grant jüise
Et il venrat faire justise,
Ensemble lui doze sanior
Que de noz faiz seront jujur,
Ne nos metet pas en oblit,
Mais proiet nos a Deu mercit.

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

940 A *Et il sera en sa j.*

944 A takes exception to *proiet* and alters to *proient*, but leaves *metet* standing. The end of the poem is formed by the following six lines in A:

Que nous puisson a lui venir,
Quant nous istrons de chest exil,
Et por venir en paradis
Che nous otroit Deus Jhesu Cris
Et madame sainte Marie,
Amen, amen, cascuns en die.

NOTES ON ROMANIC SPEECH-HISTORY.

In the following notes I use *ə* for neutral vowels similar to English *e* in *bakery*; *œ* = French *œu*; *ä* = French *a* in *ta*; *γ* = Dutch *g* in *dagen*; *ŋ* = English final *ng*; *j* = Italian *j* in *aja*; *ʎ* = Portuguese *lh*; *ñ* = Spanish *ñ*; *ɾ* is reverted *r*; *ž* = French *j*; *š* = English *sh*; *δ* = English voiced *th*. A grave accent marks stressed vowels that are open, an acute those that are close. Modern Provencial, Piedmontese and Genoese words are given in transcription, the ordinary spellings being in some respects hard to understand. Vowel-length is not indicated for Provencial, as it is not distinctive. In Mistral's dialect, a Tuscan-like principle prevails: stressed free vowels are long in paroxytones, but not elsewhere.

Ciliu.

Literary Italian has indirect *í* < *é* < *ì* before *ŋ* in *lingua* and *tinca*, beside *o* in *tronco* < *truncu*[1]. The older forms *lengua* and *tenca* (or their equivalents) are kept in many regions of Italy, including portions of Tuscany. The development of *unghia*, a variant of *ugna* < *ŭngula*, is not really contrary to *tronco*. If the *u* of *unghia* was not borrowed from *ugna*, as the *u* of *giungo* was from *giunge*, it shows that *ʎ* palatalized *ŋg* enough to modify *ù*, although the alteration of *ŋg* was not so great as in *giunge* < *iŭngit*, *lungi* < **lŭngē*[2].

Corresponding to *lingua* and *Corniglia* < *Cornēlia*, Tuscan has *í* < *é* < *ì* in *ciglio*, *consiglio*, *maraviglia*, *miglio*, *tiglia*, *tiglio*, beside *o* in *doglio* < *dōliu*, *moglie* < *mulier*. Here too the *é*-forms remain in other dialects: Venetian *çegia* (*sēdža*), *consegio*, *maravegia*, *megio*, *tegio*, Genoese *sédža*, *kuŋsédžu*, *māvédža*. The *i* of Genoese *midžu* and *tidžu* proves that these words came from Tuscany or some other region where *é* > *í* was normal before *ʎ*. Spanish has *ceja*, *consejo*, *teja*, bookish *maravilla* and imported *mijo*. Catalan has *cella*, *consell*, *meravella*, *tell*, beside imported *mill*. In Provencial we find *séjo* < *celha*, *sijo* < *cilha* and *sil* < *cil*, *kunsèu* and *kunsèl* (riming with *sulèu* = *surèl*

[1] *Modern Philology*, xi, p. 352.

[2] *Modern Philology*, xii, p. 193.

< **soliculu*), *mervéjo* and *meravijo*, *méi* and *mi*, *téjo* and *tijo*. Mistral's dialect has *è* for older *é* before final *i*, as *krèi* < *creis* < *crēscit*, *lèi* < *lēge*, so that *kunsèu* < *conselh* may be considered normal: the change of *é* to *è* was earlier than the formation of *l* from final λ. Evidently *méi* represents a different dialect that did not change *é* to *è* before λ, nor final λ to *l*.

French has *conseil*, *meil*, *merveille*, *teil*, *teille*, beside dialectal *mil*, *til*, *tille*. If *eissil* < *exĭliu* was not bookish, the *í* may have come from *eissir*; early Provencial has *eisselh* and (bookish?) *eissilh*. Meyer-Lübke holds that normal *conseille* produced analogic *conseil* for **consil*, and calls *mil* normal, assuming—or rather stating as an assumption—that there was an early change of *-ìliu* to **-íliu*[1]. This statement is surprising, for developments like *sikkə* < *siccu* beside *sékka* < *sicca*, found in southern Italy, are not over-common in France. But by reading further we learn that Meyer-Lübke does not mean what he said at first. Instead he tells us that the derivatives of *-ĭculu* and *-ĭliu* were somehow distinguished, and that final λ changed *é* to *í*, while medial λ had no such alterant effect. This theory is faulty in various ways.

It should be noted that French has normal stressed vowels in *aveu*, *espoir*, *jeu*, *meule*, *parole*, *preuve*, *relief*, whereas the corresponding verb-forms have undergone analogic change: *avoue*, *espère*, *joue*, *moud*, *parle*, *prouve*, *relève*. Thus the general probabilities are strongly against the idea that *conseil* may be analogic. Furthermore we find that *-īliu* and *-ĭculu* give the same resultant in Provencial; and that where final λ and medial λ had different effects in Provencial, final λ caused *é* to become *è* by dissimilation, parallel with *éi* > *èi*. Of course this does not show that λ ought to have had the same effect, if it had any depending on position, in the north. It is however true that the sound-system of Provencial represents, in many ways, what is found or implied in early French.

Tuscan has developed checked vowels in *fiλλa* < *filia*, *fòλλa* < *folia*, *mèλλo* < *melius*, *móλλe* < *mulier*, *paλλa* < *palea*: this important fact seems to have been overlooked by Meyer-Lübke, since he assumes that *alius* became **aλus*[2]. In western Romanic likewise, λλ was developed from *li*, at least after stressed vowels. The formation of λλ is proved for French by the checked vowels of *conseille*, *douil* < *dōliu*, *paille* < *palea*. It is a mistake to think that *fueille* and *mieus* indicate free

[1] Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Gram. der französischen Sprache*, I, Heidelberg, 1908, § 52.
[2] Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung*, [1]§ 101, [2]§ 110. If the nominative was kept long enough to develop λ, it made **aλλos* in continental Romanic.

vowels before λ. Early Provencial developed diphthongs in the derivatives of *fŏlia* and *mĕlius*, although it regularly kept free *è* and *ò* as simple sounds. These diphthongs were, like their northern equivalents, due to palatal-contact, not to free position. Palatal-contact made *è* and *ò* close in Hispanic (**fòλλa* > **fóλλa*); in Gallo-Roman it made the first portions closer (**fòλλa* > **fúoλλa*, **mèλλos* > **míeλλos*), just as vowel-harmony did in many dialects of southern Italy, where we find *pèrdə* = *perdo* beside *pièrdə* = *perdi*[1].

In the French derivatives of *mĭliu* and *tĭlia*, the sound *é* was short when long *é* became *éi*. Thus if *miλ* and *tiλ* were normal, it would nevertheless be wrong to say (as Meyer-Lübke does) that a change of *téλ* to *tiλ* must have been earlier than the general development of free *é* to *éi*. The *é* of French **péra* < *pĭra* became long so early that it made *éi*, parallel with the development of Latin *ē*. But in *mĭliu* > **méλλo* > *miλ* (dialectal) and in *tĭlia* > **téλλa* > *téλə*, the short vowels remained short after λλ was reduced to λ. Therefore it is possible that **méλo* and **téλa* were contemporary with **péra* and *téla*: the latter words had a long vowel, which became *éi* > *èi* > *ài* > *òi*, while the former had a short vowel that need not have changed to a diphthong.

If *téλ* was normal, and not analogic, it escaped a development like that of *péirə*, either because its *é* was (and always had been) short, or for another reason stated below. On the other hand, even if we call *tiλ* normal rather than dialectal, the change of long *é* to *éi* does not tell us anything about the date of the assumed formation of *tiλ* from *téλ*; it simply shows that **téλλo* (>**téλo*?) > *téλ* never had a long *é*. If we suppose that *téλ* became *tiλ* (though we can equally well assume dialectal *tiλ* < **tiλλo* < **téλλo* or *tiλ* < **tiλo* < **téλo*), it is possible that short *é* became *éi* before λ, and that the *i* was afterward absorbed while *éi* remained unchanged before non-palatal sounds. As *conseil* and *merveilt* assonate with words having *ei* < *ē*, in the *Chanson de Roland*, we must assume that there was at least a dialectal formation of *éi* from short *é* before λ. This change of *é* to *éi* was due to palatal-contact; likewise contact with *ñ* produced *ói* in Spanish **vergóiña* < **vergóñña* < **veregóndea* < *uerecundia*[2].

In early Gallo-Roman, initial *gl* and *kl* kept *l*. Some of the modern dialects of France have developed *gλ* and *kλ*, but we cannot well assume such formations in the languages that now have *l*. The same principle applies to these groups following a consonant: *masculu* > **masklo* and

[1] *Archivio glottologico italiano*, XIII, p. 303.
[2] *Modern Philology*, XII, p. 192.

cingula > **kiŋgla* keep *l* in French *mâle, sangle,* Provencial *maskle, séŋglo,* Catalan *mascle, cingla*[1]. Thus there is no good ground for thinking that intervocalic *gl* and *kl* made *gλ* in early French; we may assume *gl* > *γl* (> *jλ* ?) > λλ > λ. The sound *é* was long in **soléklo* > **soléglo,* but it became short in **soléλλo* because it was checked. Thus *soleil* has the same *e* as *vert* < *uiride.* There is a dialectal variant with diphthongal *ei* (> *oi*), assonating with words that have *ei* < *ē* in the *Chanson de Roland.* We can assume that there were regions where **soléλλo* became *soleiλ*, parallel with **konséλλo* > *konseiλ*; or that the *j* of **soléjλo* was not assimilated everywhere, if *jλ* was developed from *γl.*

The assimilative change of *γl* to λλ agrees with *ñ* < *n̄n̄* < *ηn* (*gn* in Latin spelling), and with *baillier* < *baiulare, veillier* < *uigilare, maisnie(d)e* < **mansionata, meitied* < **mejtade* < *medietate.* In these last two words the formation of *ie* shows that *n* and *t* were palatalized for a time. As *tegula* developed *γ* > *w*, it does not seem likely that *uigilare* became **veglare* in France: it is more reasonable to assume **vejelare* > **vejlare.* In the south we find *beilà* and *bailà* as variants of *bajà* < *balhar* < *baiulare,* and likewise *beilado* = *vejado* < *uigilata* indicating a basis **vejelare.* In some of the southwestern dialects, as in Hispanic, **vejlare* kept *l.* So too *meinado* < *maisnada* < **mansionata* keeps dental *n* in the south.

Meyer-Lübke's theory requires (as he rightly says) the assumption that *-iliu* > *-éλ* became *-iλ* before *-iculu* reached *-éλ.* This is the chief weakness of the theory, though clear evidence in regard to the matter is not easy to find. Provencial distinguishes intervocalic *b* < *p* and *v* < *b, d* < *t* and *z* < *δ* < *d*; French lacks such distinctions. In a general way the early Hispanic treatment of occlusives was similar to what we find in Provencial, whereas French was much less conservative. Thus if anyone wished to assume a very late levelling of *-iculu* and *-iliu* in Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan or Provencial, the assumption would be fairly reasonable; but of all the western Romanic tongues, French is apparently the one that should have lost the distinction at an early time.

Tuscan has *cigli* as an analogic variant of *ciglia*; with an independent development, a Latin plural **cilii* or **cili* would have made **celi.* It is noteworthy that *cilia* became a singular in northern Italy, and also in western Romanic. The plural was used more than the singular, and has widely replaced the derivatives of *ciliu.* In France **cili* made *cil,* with harmonic vowel-change as in *il* < **élli* < *illī*: this

[1] With *i* from *cinta* < **cīnta* (*Romanic Review,* IV, p. 382).

is why *cil* has dental *l*. The idea of explaining French *cil* as a development parallel with *cire* < *cēra*, adopted in the *Dictionnaire général* and elsewhere, is wrong. Checked *é* was not modified by a preceding palatal in French, which has *ceste* < *ecce ista*. The *i* of *cist* was produced by the final vowel of **ésti* < *istī*, not by the palatal consonant. Therefore a derivative of *ciliu* would have rimed with *conseil*, just as *celh* does with *conselh* in early Provencial.

From what is said above, it seems reasonable to draw the following conclusions: in the early dialects of France, both northern and southern; *é* was generally kept before λ, but in certain forms of rustic speech it changed to *i*; in the equivalents of Italian *miglio*, *tiglia*, *tiglio*, urban speech often adopted the rustic names; in apparent derivatives of *ciliu* and *cilia*, the influence of normal *cil* < **cili* changed *é* to *i*. Mistral gives words that he spells '*souluou*' and '*souruou*' as variants of his '*soulèu*' (*sulèu*). Though the reader is left to guess how these two words are stressed, their history seems clear. They represent **sulíλ* < **soléλλo*, with dialectal *i* < *é* as in *mi* < *milh* (beside *méi* < *melh*) < **méλλo* < *miliu*, but with final *u* < *l* < λ as in *sulèu*; the *i* of **sulíu* was labialized by contact with *u*. The *i* of *meravijo* < *meravilha* may be bookish, or parallel with that of *ourijo*. The *i* of *ourijo*, a variant of *ouréjo* < *aurelha* < *auricula*, can have come (like the *ō* of Latin *ōricula*) from the rustic speech of nurses, who taught it to young town-children.

Ciuile.

Meyer-Lübke's Romanic dictionary does not mention *cīuīle*. In popular speech the first *i* became open (by dissimilation?), corresponding to the *e* of words derived from *uīcīnu*. This alteration was probably general in Italy, notwithstanding *vicino* and Sardic *bighinu*. Pretonic *i* < *e* is common in Tuscan, and stressless vowels are often assimilated in Sardic, so that *vicino* and *bighinu* may contain *i* < *e* < *i*. Apparently Paduan *zoile*, pronounced *tsoíle*, was a normal derivative of *ciuile*: *e* changed to *o*, as in Tuscan *dovere* < *dēbēre*, and *v* was absorbed by the *o*. The word *zoile* is used by Beolco[1].

Corona.

Italian *cruna* seems to be a variant of *corona* < *corōna*. In the *Archivio glottologico italiano*, X, 5, Ascoli assumes that *cruna* represents a dialectal alteration of the Latin word. There is no need of going back to Latin to account for the *u*. In northwestern Italy *u* has

[1] Pasqualigo, *Lingua rustica padovana*, Verona, 1908, p. 153.

generally replaced former close *o*, so that *cruna* may be a much later loan-word, although earlier than Dante's time. In modern Genoese, which has lost intervocalic *r*, *kuruŋa* is partially Tuscan, like *mariu* beside normal *māju* < *marītu*; but the older language may have possessed a native form that produced *cruna*. The loss of the first vowel could have been a Tuscan development, in accord with *d(i)ritto* and *d(i)rietro* > *dietro*. It should be added that *ó* > *ú* is normal in Sicilian, which has *cruna*[1] and *curuna* < *corōna*; but this dialect seems a less likely source of the Tuscan word. It is, however, rather strange that such a word should travel at all. Can we suppose that Genoa taught Tuscany how to make needles? The *g* of *ago* would be normal in Genoese, which has *amīgu* < *amīcu*.

Cucumere.

Meyer-Lübke admits, in his Romanic dictionary, that *cucumis* has four derivatives: Italian *cocomero*, early Provencial *cogombre*, Spanish *cohombro*, Portuguese *cogombro*. There are others that seem worthy of mention, and are indeed mentioned by well-known writers; for example Sardic *cugúmere*, *cugúmbiri* (Spano), Italian *cocómbaro*, *cocómbero*, *cocómmero*, *cogómero* (Petròcchi), early Provencial *cocombre* (Levy), modern *kukumbre*, *kuŋkumbre*, *kugumbre*, *kulumbre*, *kudumbre*, *kudume* and Catalan *cogombre* (Mistral), Portuguese *cocombro*, *cocongro*, *cobrombo* (Cornu). All of these forms, aside from Sardic, admit or require a basis ending in *u* or *o*. The alteration of *e* arose from the influence of such words as *piru* and *pomu*. Most of the consonant-changes are plainly due to assimilation or dissimilation.

In western Romanic the development of *g*, in derivatives of **cucumeru*, was often hindered by what may be called negative assimilation: initial *k* kept its neighbour from becoming *g*. Another case of the same kind is to be seen in Provencial *kukurdo* = *kugurdo* < *cucurbita*. As Tuscan has *g* < *k* in *vergogna*, it would seem that *cogomero* is normal in respect to this sound; contrary *cicogna* is parallel with *cocomero* and Provencial *kukumbre*. The *mm*-form agrees with *femmina*; the added *b* apparently shows that the third vowel was sometimes dropped, as in Emilian *cucombra*, or at least that such a change occurred in derivatives with stressed suffixes. The relation of Spanish *cogombro* to *cohombro* is not clear. Andalusian has the fricative *γ* in the words written *agosto*, *hago*, *lugar*, and this sound is sometimes lost before *w* (*awa* < *aγwa*). As intervocalic *δ* commonly disappears in Andalusian, it is possible that

[1] Pitrè, *Proverbi siciliani*, IV, Palermo, 1880, p. 395.

cohombro is likewise merely a southern equivalent of Castilian *cogombro*. It is also possible that *cogombro* lost *g* by dissimilation, parallel with Italian *Faenza* < *Fauentia* and Portuguese *falar* for **favlar* = Spanish *hablar*. Meyer-Lübke says that French *co(n)combre* was borrowed from Provencial *cogombre*. This theory is unreasonable and needless. If the French word was borrowed, its source presumably had a medial *k*. But the retention of *k* does not prove that French *co(n)combre* was either borrowed or bookish.

Rumanian contains evidence of the stressless development *u* > *o*, although it did not share in the Italian change of *ù* to *ó*[1]. We may therefore assume that stressless *u* > *o* was generally earlier than *ù* > *ó* in continental Romanic: Rumanian separated from Italian before *gula* became *góla*, but after *manu* had changed to *mano*. Thus *cucumis* became **kùkomes*; by analogy the nominative produced *o-ò* as a variant of normal *o-ù* in **kokòmere* beside **kokùmere*. The re-stressed stressless short *o*, derived from *u*, was developed so early that it received the quality of ordinary *ò*. This does not necessarily mean that stressless *o* (< *u*) was regularly open; it indicates simply that there was no short *ó* in the language at that time. Consequently when a short *o* was put in the place of *ù*, it had to be *ò*. A more widespread change of *u* to *ò* is found in the derivatives of *colubra*. In this word *ò-u* developed through *ò-o* (not through *o-ù*, as is sometimes assumed) to *o-ò*. It is possible that here the openness of *o* was due to assimilation before the stress was displaced; but such an assumption is not needful.

The ordinary sources of Genoese stressed *œ* are free *ò*, and *o* (open or close) before a palatal. Where close *o* was not in contact with an early palatal, it has regularly become *u*, as in *buka*, *dū*, *dūse*, *duze*, *gūa*, *gumiu*, corresponding to Tuscan *bocca*, *dolore*, *dolce*, *dódici*, *gola*, *gómito*, Provencial *buko*, *dulur*, *dus*, *dudze*, *gulo*, *kúide*. Genoese *kigœmòu* comes from **kokòmero*, in accordance with *fœa* < *fŏras*, *stœmagu* < *stŏmachu* and *ténou* < **tienero* < *tĕneru*, *zénou* < *gĕneru*. In the *Archivio glottologico italiano*, XVI, 149, Parodi assumes that the *i* of *kigœmou* was due to lingual vowel-assimilation, followed by labial dissimilation. It would be simpler to assume a dissimilative change of *o* to *e*, corresponding to Spanish *hermoso* < *formōsu*, Italian *sirocchia* < *sororcula*. Stressless free *e* > *i* (before a consonant) is rarer in Genoese than in Tuscan, but it seems to be usual where the next vowel is *œ*[2].

[1] *Modern Language Review*, IX, p. 496.

[2] *Archivio glottologico italiano*, XVI, p. 141. Apparently Genoese *œ* is close, like the vowel of French *vœu*; but I have not been able to find trustworthy evidence in regard to the quality, and therefore leave it unmarked.

As equivalents of Tuscan *cocomero*, Piedmontese has *kəkəmu*, *kəkumu*, *kukumu*. The vowels of *kukumu* < **kokómero* are normal; *kəkumu* represents **kekómero*, with *o-ó* dissimilated to *e-ó*. In the *Archivio glottologico italiano*, XVI, 523, Toppino says that the form *kəkəmu* indicates assimilation of the stressed vowel to the preceding vowel. This explanation seems too simple. Can any similar developments be found in Romanic speech-history? I do not know of any; French *fis* < *fēcī* is not a perfect parallel.

Rumanian distinguishes stressed *u* < *ŭ* and *o* < *ō*, but levels *e* < *ē* and *e* < *ĭ*. In continental Romanic, *ó* < *ù* was later than *é* < *ì*, and Rumanian separated from Italian between the two periods. We may therefore assume that when *pĭra* had become *péra*, a change of **kùkomes* to **kùkemes* produced analogic **kokémere*. This form, with a changed ending and with a later assimilation of *o-é* to *e-é*, corresponds to *kəkəmu*. The same dialect has *läŋgwa* < *lĭngua*, *mäi* < *mĭliu*, *maläñ* < *malĭgnu*, *säñ* < *sĭgnu*, *säm* < *sēmu*, *täm* < **tìmo*, beside *auṛija* < *aurĭcula*, *tija* < *tĭlia*, *maliña* < *malĭgna*, *liña* < *lĭgna*, *səma* < *sēma*, *təma* < **tìmat*, *təmu* < *tĭment*. The medial *k* of **kokémero* was kept voiceless by the initial *k*, and the same influence hindered a change of *k* to *tš*, which would have made a modern *s* or *z*.

From the ending of Provencial *kudume* and the similar one of Gascon *kugum* (*'cougoum'* in Lespy's Bearnese dictionary), it appears that *cucumi* has left some direct derivatives, with the stress adapted to that of *cucumere*. We can assume that **kokómere* changed **kókome* to **kokóme*.

*Cuorte.

In Meyer-Lübke's Romanic dictionary, Sardic *'curte'* is given as a derivative of **curte* (= *cohorte*). In the *Revue de dialectologie romane*, IV, 135, Wagner says that there is and was no such Sardic form. If Wagner is right about this matter, 'Albanian *kurtə*' should be put in the place of 'Sardic *curte*,' *Modern Language Review*, IX, 493, and 'Albanian' in the place of 'Sardic' near the end of the same paragraph; and *'curte* < **cuorte*,' at the bottom of page 498, should be crossed out. Since Sardic has *doighi* < *duodeci*, it is possible that Sardic *corte* came from **cuorte*. As a native development, it cannot represent **curte*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., U.S.A.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

I. 'IRALAND' (ALFRED'S 'OROSIUS,' I, 1).

EDITORS of Alfred's *Orosius* have usually regarded the above word in the account of Ohthere's voyage southward along the west coast of the Scandinavian peninsula as a mistake. The assumption has been that Ireland could not have been referred to for geographical reasons, and because the name Ireland was not used so early. On the other hand Ch. Fr. Dahlmann, in his *Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Geschichte*, I, 443 (1822), argued for the manuscript reading against Rask's contention for *Isaland* 'Iceland.' Dahlmann emphasizes that early geographers, as Ptolemy and Strabo[1], placed Ireland farther north than its real position, and thus in more direct line from the Scandinavian peninsula. It is no greater error, one may recall, than when Caesar in his *Commentaries* makes the south-western corner of England 'point toward Spain.' Early writers on geography, lacking accurate measurement of distance and direction, often seem grossly inaccurate to-day. Yet our own geographical notions often need equal rectification. It is with something like a shock that we learn the general course of the Panama canal is from west to east, or that the extreme point of Alaska is farther west of San Francisco than the latter is west of New York.

Dahlmann also cites Adam of Bremen for a statement regarding the geography of Ireland and Scandinavia exactly like that of Ohthere to Alfred. The sentence may well be quoted from the fourth book of the *Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum*, ch. 10:

> Ab Aquilone vero idem Oceanus insulas praeterlabitur Orchadas, deinde infinitis orbem terrae spaciis ambit, sinistrorsum habens Hyberniam, Scotorum patriam, quae nunc Irland dicitur, dextrorsum vero scopulos Nordmanniae, ulterius autem insulas Island, Gronland ; ibi terminatur Oceanus, qui dicitur caligans[2].

[1] This is especially true of Strabo, see Spruner-Menke, *Atlas Antiquus*. Beazley, *Dawn of Modern Geography*, II, 546, adds Solinus to Ptolemy and Strabo.

[2] I quote from Lappenberg's text in *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, a somewhat better one than that before Dahlmann. In the Migne edition *Irland* is printed *Island*, evidently by mistake.

The description, it will be noticed, reverses the directions of Ohthere's voyage, but specifies the same relative positions of Scandinavia, Ireland and the Orchades (Orkneys). Otherwise, though written a century later, it confirms in a striking way the Alfredian *Orosius*. Moreover, Dahlmann answers the objection that Ohthere intended Scotland rather than Ireland by showing that while Ireland was sometimes called Scotland, the reverse was not true in such cases as could be used for argument on this passage.

To Dahlmann's excellent argument for the manuscript reading may be added some minor notes. First, *Iraland* occurs twice in the manuscript and the reading is unusually clear. Then *Island*, not *Isaland*, would be the natural form of the name, and *Island* could not have been confused with *Iraland* simply by a misreading of *s* as *r*. Again, the more direct route from Scandinavia to Ireland was around the northern part of Scotland, and this might easily have given the idea that Ireland was relatively nearer to Scandinavia than we know it to be.

Finally, and the point seems not to have been sufficiently considered in its bearings, Iceland was not discovered by the Norsemen until about 850, and not settled until after 872, that is until after Alfred came to the throne. While there was sufficient time for it to become known in England before the Alfredian *Orosius* was translated, there is no evidence that it was so known. There is no reference to it in *Orosius* or the *Chronicle*, and the English word *Island* first appears more than three centuries later in Layamon's *Brut*, 22467—an earlier reference than that of line 22622 given in the *New Eng. Dict.* On the other hand Ireland had been known to the Norsemen for nearly a century and settled almost as long, so that the use of the name by a Norseman would not have been in the least strange. This, too, even if Ireland was usually called Hibernia, or Scotland, by the English. The name Ireland (*Yrland*) also appears in later English considerably before that of Iceland, as in the F text of the *Chronicle* (891), the manuscript of which is of the late eleventh or early twelfth century. It is worth noting that if the entry could be as old as the date assigned, it would correspond closely with the probable time of making the *Orosius* translation and the entry under discussion.

It would seem, then, that the manuscript reading, *Iraland*, in Alfred's *Orosius* I, 1, can be amply supported, and that the burden of proof clearly remains with those proposing a change.

II. 'TRĘSON' ('TREASON').

In *Mod. Lang. Notes*, VII, 254 (1892), I proposed to read the *Chronicle* entry under 1135, which Thorpe transliterated *þa wes tre sona þas landes* and Earle-Plummer *þe westre sona þas landes*, as *þa wes treson a þas landes*, 'there was treason in these lands.' This was at once accepted by Plummer in a personal letter, and in 1899 given in his Notes (*Saxon Chronicles*, II, 307). In Kluge's *Mittelenglisches Lesebuch* (1904) it is suggested in the *Glossar* under *westre*, with Schröer's name added. Why Schröer's name should have been used I do not know, and it has been omitted in the 'zweite Auflage' (1912).

At the time I suggested the emendation, by which this new romance word in English form emerges for the first time, no facsimile of that part of the manuscript was known to me and I had not seen the original. The publication some years ago of *Angelsächsische Palæographie* by Wolfgang Keller made accessible a photographic reproduction of this part of the Laud manuscript, and allows a new judgment of the reasonableness of the reading. It shows that the words of this entry were written with almost no separation, often actually none, so that the passage looks like *þawestresonaþaslandes*. This renders even more probable the division I formerly proposed, and I think no one with the facsimile or the manuscript before him can doubt the correctness of the emendation.

The form *a* = *an* 'in' may be from loss of *n*, as I formerly suggested, and illustrated, or from absence of the breve above the letter to indicate *n*, since the breve is often used by this writer as by others. In any case this passage furnishes a clear example of the French word *treason* (*trę̄son*) in English almost a century before the earliest example cited by the *New Eng. Dict.* The latter's example, too, *treison* from the *Ancren Riwle*, does not show the monophthong necessary to account for our modern word and common enough in the Midland dialect. For its phonology see Behrens, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Sprache in England*, p. 133.

III. 'AFTERDINER,' 'AFTERMETE,' 'AFTERSOPER.'

In Skeat's very full Glossarial Index to his *Works of Chaucer* (1894), as well as in that accompanying his *Student's Chaucer* (1895), he gives the compound preposition *at-after*, with references to six places in the Poems. In these six places in the text the preposition is also printed *at-after*. Such a form is alone surprising enough, since no such

compound preposition occurs in Old English or the Modern period. Nor has any other editor followed Skeat in this form, although no editor of Chaucer has correctly printed the compound nouns with *after* which the simple preposition *at* governs in these and other places.

The first of these, *afterdiner*, occurs in the *Shipman's Tale*, 255 (B 1445), and the *Franklin's Tale*, 190 (F 918):

> At afterdiner Daun John sobrely;
> At afterdiner gonne they to daunce.

The second, *aftermete* 'aftermeat,' occurs in the *Merchant's Tale*, 677 (E 1921):

> At aftermete ye with your wommen alle.

The third, *aftersoper* 'aftersupper,' also occurs twice, in the *Squire's Tale*, 294 (F 302), and in the *Franklin's Tale*, 491 (F 1219):

> At aftersoper gooth this noble king;
> At aftersoper fille they in trete.

That these words are true compounds we might infer from the frequency of such forms in Old English. Thus the Toller-Bosworth *Dictionary* gives eighteen compounds with *after* as the first part in a similar sense. For Modern English the *Century Dictionary* has thirty-two such compounds, not all in common use at present, but all recorded in works of some period. Shakespeare alone has thirteen such compounds with *after*. Two of Chaucer's three compounds are found in Elizabethan English and recorded in the *New Eng. Dict.* Thus *afterdinner* as a plural is part of the title in Sandford's *Houres of Recreation or Afterdinners* (1576), and the word is found as a genitive in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*, III, i, 33, and *Troilus*, II, iii, 121. The expressions there are 'an afterdinner's sleep,' and 'an afterdinner's breath,' where we should now use *afterdinner* as an adjective—'an afterdinner speech.' Shakespeare has also *aftersupper* as a noun in *Midsummer*, V, 34:

> Between our aftersupper and bedtime,—

a use exactly like that of Chaucer.

Both *afterdiner* and *aftersoper* are analogical compounds with a second French element, proof enough of the frequency and influence of such forms in Middle English, although only nine such words are recorded by Maetzner. He has omitted all these Chaucer examples, except that he says under *at*:

> In Verbindung mit einem durch *after* bestimmten Begriffe verhält sich *at* wie zu einem einfachen Zeitbegriffe.

He then cites *at after soper* (*Franklin's Tale*, 491) without indicating composition, and *att after Easter* from Halliwell's *Dict. of Archaic Words*, where *aftereaster* is as much a true compound as the other words. The above *aftermete* 'aftermeat,' which may be the oldest of all since a true English compound, is not recorded in any dictionary. Incidentally, the first examples in Chaucer, *afterdiner*, *aftersoper*, are the earliest uses of the words so far noted, antedating the examples in the *New Eng. Dict.* by about two centuries, while *aftermete*, *aftereaster*, also deserve to be recorded in that compendium of lexicography. As colloquial words we should not expect to find them often in books. Whether the forms should be written with a hyphen or not is another matter, but the proper stress is better suggested by the close compound, as in *afterglow*, *aftermath*, *afterpiece*[1].

Oliver Farrar Emerson.

Cleveland, U.S.A.

'A Good Kissing Carrion' ('Hamlet' ii, 2, 182).

In modern texts of *Hamlet* there has been a general rejection of Warburton's emendation of *God* for *good* in Hamlet's unfinished sentence, 'For if the sun breeds maggots in a dead dog, being a *god* kissing carrion,—'; and a return to the quarto-folio reading of '*good* kissing carrion.' This rejection of Warburton's emendation and of his interpretation accompanying it has been, I believe, not because this interpretation does not offer an explanation satisfactory in itself, but because it is unaccompanied by *proof* that such an explanation was the obvious meaning of Hamlet's words to Shakespeare's contemporaries. It is the purpose of this note to point out that Warburton's interpretation of this passage receives support from the fact that the idea of the sun breeding maggots in a dead body was used by sixteenth and seventeenth century writers, as Hamlet uses it, to describe the general depravity of mankind.

Warburton's explanation of the passage in question identifies the carrion, corrupting under the rays of the sun, with man, 'dead in

[1] In reviewing *Poems of Sir John Salusbury and Robert Chester* (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, ix, 533), Professor G. C. Moore Smith suggested an emendation, *after* for the printed *astor*, which probably reveals another early example of *afterdinner*. On p. xvi of the *Introduction* occurs the entry: 'David Salusbury the sonne of John Salusbury of lleweny Esquier was borne upon Thuesday the 19 of August about 2 of the Clocke in the astor Dinn'. [1600.] Professor Smith also furnishes me another example from Wallace's *Life of Sir Philip Sidney*, p. 58: 'from...Sunday at supper...until the 8th of September being Sunday at after dinner.' [1566.]

original sin'; and the sun, breeding maggots in a dead dog, with 'the supreme cause of all things, diffusing its blessings on man, who, instead of showing a proper return of duty, breeds only corruption and vices.' [Warburton's note in full is found conveniently in Furness's New Variorum ed. of *Hamlet* (II, 2, 180).] As Warburton points out, this interpretation of Hamlet's words shows them to be a continuation of his immediately preceding statement, that 'to be honest, as this world goes, is to be one man picked out of ten thousand.'

Philip Stubbes in his *Anatomy of Abuses* (Shakespeare Society ed., p. 79), which was published in numerous editions in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, employs Hamlet's comparison of carrion corrupting in the sun, to develop the idea of the depravity of man:

> Can that thing which is moste glorious and fair of itself, make any thing foule or ilfavored? the sun is a most glorious and fair creature, and therfor cannot make them fowler then they are of their own nature. From whence then is it that the Sun burneth them, and altereth their orient colour into woorser hue? The cause therof proceedeth from their own genuine corruption and natural imperfection; for no more is their fowlenes to be ascribed to the stelliferous beams of the glistering Sun, then the stench of a dead carcasse may be said to come of the sun, and not rather of it own corruption and filthines. They busie themselves in preserving the beautie of their bodyes, which lasteth but for a time, and in time is cause of his own corruption, and which, in effect, is nothing els then putrifaction itself, and a dunghil covered with white and red; but for the beautie of the soule they care nothing at all.

William Prynne, also, in his voluminous discussion of the wickedness of 'stage-plays' (*Histrio-mastix*, 1633, p. 961) gives a clear picture of 'the dunghill [man's nature] which can no ways maculate its [the sun's] pure rays':

> The Sunne shines on a dung-hill, [some people argue], and yet its beames are not defiled by it; so men may looke on Stage plays and yet not be polluted; for unto the pure all things are pure..... To this I answer first, that the Sunne is of a pure and celestiall nature, uncapable of any defilement whatsoever; its shining therefore on a dunghill can no ways maculate its pure rayes, which oft-times make the dung-heape stinke the more. But mans nature as it was capable of pollution at the first, before Adams fall, so it is altogether filthy, stinking, and corrupted since,...No wonder then if Stage-playes (which if we believe S. Chrysostome, are farre more contagious and filthy then any dung,) defile mens vitious natures, though no stinking dung-heape can pollute the shining Sunne....Mans nature is not onely prone, but precipitate unto evill things; and shall Christians then thinke themselves, as uncapable of contagion as the shining Sunne? God forbid: we may perchange bee such in Heaven hereafter, as neither *velle, nec posse peccare*; but here we cannot be such; For what man among us can say, that he hath made his heart cleane, and that he is pure from Sinne?

Prynne refers (p. 963) to Tertullian's similar refutation of the same argument by play-goers, which it is likely was known to Shakespeare, since Tertullian's condemnation of the theatre played an important part in the attacks by the sixteenth century puritans upon the stage. Tertullian attests to the antiquity of Hamlet's association of ideas:

I heard recently a novel defence of himself by a certain play-lover. 'The sun,' said he, 'nay God Himself, looks down from the heaven on the show, and no pollution is contracted.' Yes, and the sun, too, pours down his rays into the common sewer without being defiled. As for God, would that all crimes were hid from His eyes, that we might all escape judgment! But he looks on robberies too; He looks on falsehoods, and adulteries, and frauds, and idolatries, and these same shows; and precisely on that account we will not look on them. You are putting on the same level, O man, the criminal and the judge; the criminal who is a criminal because he is seen, and the Judge who is a Judge because he sees. (Tertullian, Vol. I, p. 27, in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Vol. XI.)

If Hamlet had completed his interrupted thought, then, he would have strengthened his preceding statement and have doubted the existence of even the one honest man in ten thousand, since *all* 'men's natures are not only prone but precipitate unto evill things.' 'This being so,' he continues to Polonius, 'let your daughter, who is not otherwise than other men of earth, not walk in the sun for fear of corruption.'

Warburton's interpretation, therefore, enables us to fit Hamlet's broken words closely into the thought of this scene, arising as they do out of what immediately precedes, and being the occasion of what immediately follows.

M. P. Tilley.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

On the Meaning of 'Almus' in Dante.

In my note on this subject in the last number of this *Review* (Vol. XI, p. 342), I stated that 'Dante only uses the Latin word *almus* once' (viz. in the title of *Epist.* v). So far as his works in the printed editions are concerned this statement holds good. But I now have another instance which is supplied by the MS. reading of a passage in *Epist.* vi (the letter to the Florentines). In the passage in question (ll. 39—40) the *textus receptus*, as represented by the *Oxford Dante*, reads: 'Nempe legum sanctiones altissime declarant.' The word *altissime*, however (for which Torri reads *aperte*), is not in the MS., and is due simply to the ignorance of the transcriber. The MS. reading is *alme* (=*almae*) (see *M. L. R.*, Vol. VII, p. 15, n. 15); so that the sentence correctly runs: 'Nempe legum sanctiones almae declarant,' i.e. 'the sacred precepts of the law declare,' the word *almus* here being obviously used in the sense of *sanctus*, as in the instances quoted in my previous note.

Paget Toynbee.

Fiveways, Burnham, Bucks.

REVIEWS

The Assumption of the Virgin. A Miracle Play from the N-Town Cycle. Edited by W. W. Greg. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1915. 8vo. 75 pp.

This appears to be the first of a series of studies which Dr Greg proposes to devote to some of the difficult problems bearing on the interrelations of the miracle-play cycles and the processes of assembling and accretion by which they reached their present forms. The task is one well suited to his gift of lucid analysis and patient handling of complicated evidence. The *Assumption* play of the so-called Ludus Coventriae is written on a separate quire inserted in the middle of one of the other quires of the manuscript, and is in a hand which does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript. Halliwell assigned it to a date fifty years later than 1468, when the rest was written. This Dr Greg demonstrates to be wrong. The play has been rubricated throughout with its fellows and by the hand of their principal scribe. He then proceeds to examine successively the scribal peculiarities, the dialect, and the metre of the play, with a view to possible traces of authorship distinct from that of other component parts of the cycle, and arrives at the conclusion that it 'is probably the original work of a single author, who, if responsible for anything else in the cycle, is reponsible for revisional work only, though the dialect in which he wrote is not distinguishable from that of the rest of the collection, and further that his play was copied by a scribe who, though different from the one who wrote the bulk of the volume, belonged to the same district and had some of the same peculiarities.' Incidentally he has been led to provide a transcript of the play as it stands in the manuscript, having found that the text given by Halliwell entirely obscured the clues afforded by the rubrics to the very peculiar character of the versification, in which the stanzas, some of eight and others of thirteen lines, are linked together by extra-stanzaic lines and couplets, which generally rhyme with the stanza that follows. A text of the chapter of the *Legenda Aurea* from which the author worked completes his material. It is perhaps worth noting that, in other cycles besides that of the N-Town, the *Assumption* play, possibly for doctrinal reasons, appears to have undergone exceptional treatment. The York plays contain, in addition to the Ostlers' play of the *Assumption and Coronation*, a fragment of a distinct and later Innholders' play of the *Coronation*. This seems to point to an

elaboration of the Mariolatric theme. On the other hand both plays were suppressed at post-Reformation performances, and a similar change must have taken place at Chester, for while there is no *Assumption* in the late extant texts, the pre-Reformation banns afford evidences that it once existed, and was played, not by one of the regular craft-gilds, but by 'the worshipfull wyves of this towne.' I suspect that it was a late addition to the original framework of the cosmic miracle-play. Wakefield knew it not, nor Cornwall.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

PINNER.

Othello: an Historical and Comparative Study. By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. (*University of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature,* II.) Minneapolis. 1915. 8vo. 70 pp.

This is part of a 'skeptical' campaign which Dr Stoll is conducting against those critics who approached Shakespeare from the study rather than the stage, and who are therefore in his view inclined to look for a much more logical psychology in the plays than the dramatist's audience demanded or than he ever dreamed of giving them. No doubt Othello's easy fall to the fairly obvious wiles of Iago affords an admirable battle-ground for such a dispute.

> Everybody else, so far as I am aware, has recourse to some one or other of the approved means for preserving to us a Shakespearean character's dubious identity—Fate or a distracted order of Society, the all-compelling arts of the villain, the blinding of passion, the extraordinary circumstances of the marriage, racial and social characteristics and differences, Desdemona's duplicity, or (taking the bull fairly by the horns) mere psychology itself. Another interpretation, which explains, but makes no attempt to explain away, the contradiction, is, that we have here the simple convention of the calumniator believed, as old as the story of Potiphar's wife or of the wicked counselors of Germanic heroic legend, which, though modified, constantly reappears in drama, ancient, Elizabethan, or modern, down almost to Ibsen's day.

Dr Stoll argues his thesis with spirit and abundantly, although in the true dissertation style he interposes between his readers and the play a cloud of citations from other critics of more or less eminence, and of 'comparative' parallels from other treatments of the 'calumny' theme, such as Dolce's *Marianna* and Voltaire's *Zaïre*, which I for one find rather tiresome. The latter, however, are presumably material to his purpose of establishing this existence of a dramatic convention, of which as between stage and audience the psychology was taken for granted. I suppose that the reply of the 'orthodox' critics attacked will be that, while the existence of the convention is admitted, it is none the less the function of the dramatist's art to make it plausible, and the privilege of genius to make it convincing. I do not think that this is one of the cases, of which some can be found in the plays, in

which Shakespeare conceals a false dramatic situation beneath a *bravura* of technique. The drama, indeed, is philosophical rather than psychological. But possibly both the orthodox explainers away of Othello's psychological discontinuity and the 'skeptic' who thinks that the audience was content to take each scene as it came, without troubling themselves about the links, have given insufficient attention to the difference in method between the drama and the novel. A novelist, if he thinks fit, can keep his subject continuously within the range of your vision, and elaborate the process of psychological evolution before you in the minutest detail. The dramatist is compelled to breaches of continuity. He has but five windows behind which his personages successively appear. They are recognisable, but not the same, on each occasion. And their evolution goes on even during the intervals in which they are hidden from sight.

E. K. Chambers.

Pinner.

Shakespeare's Theater. (With sectional bibliographies and 29 illustrations.) By Ashley H. Thorndike. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1916. 8vo. xvi + 460 pp.

There could be no more appropriate time fully to report progress in Elizabethan investigation than the Shakespeare Tercentenary, and in striving to present a well-ordered synthesis of (for the most part recently ascertained) facts, which should make 'amicable approximation toward agreement on essentials,' while steering clear of the quicksands of controversy, Professor Thorndike has compiled an excellent work of reference. For this the specialist who knows precisely what to accept and what to reject will be profoundly thankful; nor will the student who comes to the book with open mind be, at any point, led seriously astray, for, if Professor Thorndike indulges occasionally in misleading generalizations and errs here and there in minor detail, his conclusions are almost invariably sound and his atmosphere true. One could perhaps have spared the sporadic American topical allusions, but criticism on this score is disarmed by the fact that the book is designed almost as much for the general reader as for the student.

Professor Thorndike appears at his best when speaking for himself, and not from his brief, as in his three last chapters. Where his authorities are hazy on any particular phase of his subject, he shares their lack of grasp, a fact which goes to show that a perfectly satisfactory synthesis of this order cannot be attained without considerable original research and much wearisome trudging of the byepaths. Thus in his opening chapter we find some confusion of the characteristics of the neo-classic scene (as determined by Serlio in basing on Vitruvius) and the multiple or simultaneous scene. Seeing that each had its own individual influence on Elizabethan dramaturgy this is a grave defect.

We are told (p. 16) that 'in Plautus or Terence, the doors in the back represented houses, but all the action took place in front of the houses, and the convention was readily enough adopted into English comedy.' Here, apart from the fact that of the process of adoption we learn nothing, the analogy and the implication are equally erroneous. A glance at Serlio's 'Scene for Comedies' will show that the houses in the neo-classic scene were ranged at the sides and not at the back. Professor Thorndike seems to be labouring under the delusion that all the early comedies based on the Plautine convention, such as *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, *The Supposes* and *Mother Bombie*, were played on a bare stage with some sort of elementary tiring-house background. But a careful examination of their construction by anyone capable of visualizing the action will show that they demanded a neo-classic setting, with practicable doors and windows. Dominant as it was in Italy, there can be little doubt that this style of setting was commoner in England than evidence demonstrates and that to its prevalence we owe the abounding window-scenes of the later Elizabethan drama.

As for Professor Thorndike's confusion of the multiple with the neo-classic setting we first find traces of it at p. 21, where he says: 'the court performances, always indulging in elaborate decorations, were similar in the capitals of Europe, and underwent the same process, their expensive spectacles changing from the multiple setting to successive scenes.' To assume that the early Italian courts ever favoured the heterogeneous multiple scene is to deny the influence there of all classical prescript. Yet Italian comedy, whether learned or unlearned, had its origin in the Plautine convention. The English University Drama of the mid-sixteenth century had an analogous upspringing, and, viewing the indications in Bereblock and elsewhere of the employment of the neo-classic scene at Oxford and Cambridge, it is amazing to find it stated (p. 160, note) that plays were given at both universities in 1566 with multiple settings. It is seriously to be doubted if a setting so hostile to all classical concepts as the multiple scene ever gained any acceptance at the seats of learning. A page or two later one begins to question Professor Thorndike's knowledge of the salient characteristics of this setting on finding him arguing that a play written on its principles admitted of alternative staging on the tapestried Elizabethan platform. There are many situations in the multiple-setting drama, where two *mansions* are employed conjunctively, which do not admit of realisation on any other kind of scene except that for which they were written. *Sapho and Phao*, v, 2 is a case in point.

In the chapter on 'The Playhouses,' several statements call for revision. Of the inns it is inaccurate to say they had 'a narrow entrance leading to an interior courtyard, around which ran galleries connecting with the rooms in the upper stories.' As the well-known view of the Falcon Tavern indicates, the central entrance was broad enough to admit a carrier's waggon and the galleries never ran round more than three sides, generally only two. What is the authority for the assertion that 'for many years, however, after permanent theaters

had been erected in London, plays continued to be given in the places for bear-baiting'? We have no record of any theatrical performances at any Bear Garden except the Hope, and Professor Thorndike admits that plays were only given there occasionally for a few years. Throughout this chapter as elsewhere we find a highly improper use of the term 'pit.' It is employed to connote the yard of the early public theatres regardless of the fact that the term did not come into vogue until the second decade of the seventeenth century and was for long exclusively applied to the ground floor of the private theatres. Professor Thorndike's study of the old maps is lacking in thoroughness. The 'Plan of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth' given in Hughson's *London* is absolutely devoid of all authenticity. It is a debased version of the so-called 'Ryther' map with additions of the Bull and Bear Rings from the Braun and Hogenburg and the Agar maps. In reproducing the Ryther map Professor Thorndike dates it 1604, thus ignoring Dr William Martin's objection that the map in showing London Bridge stripped of the houses destroyed in the fire of 1633 must have been issued at a considerably later period. On this showing the map cannot be taken as yielding views of the Theater and the first Fortune (p. 56), and Professor Thorndike's statements on pp. 45 and 450 are contradictory, implying as they do that the Theater and the Curtain stood on the same site. Nor is there any sort of warrant for placing the Rose to the south of the Hope and Globe in the plan given of the Bankside; on the contrary it runs counter to the evidence of the maps. Whatever may be the uncertainty as to the exact site of the Globe there is no uncertainty as to the site of the Rose. Its position is known to-day through an unbroken series of ground-leases. Moreover, it can always be identified on the old maps (e.g. the so-called Ryther) by the low wall which surrounded it (Greg, *The Henslowe Papers*, 43 and 44). Rendle's blunder that the Rose was burnt down—a confusion with the Rose Tavern—should not be repeated. It is time also that it should be recognised that Wilkinson is wholly untrustworthy as an authority on the old theatres. Professor Thorndike is evidently unaware that the view given in *Londina Illustrata* as representing the second Fortune has been shown by me to depict the battered exterior of the Nursery in Golding Lane (cf. *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, Band 132, pp. 301 ff., 'Restoration Stage Nurseries'). It is incorrect to say that Salisbury Court continued to be used until 'about 1670' when it gave way to the Duke's in Dorset Garden. Salisbury Court was burnt down in the Great Fire and the Duke's Theatre was not opened until November 1671. Nor did the first Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, immediately supersede the Cockpit. The latter was still in use two years after the Theatre Royal was built.

In reproducing Dr Albright's sketch for a typical Shakespearean stage Professor Thorndike conspires to give it a further publicity which its merits hardly warrant. He admits that the stage space is too restricted but he fails to see that the excessively high and narrow 'shadow' would have afforded the players and stage spectators practically

no protection from the elements. While it is feasible to place the tiring-house front within the curve of the auditorium, thus making the interior an unbroken circle and obviating view-obstructing corners, the disposition challenges all the evidence on the point we possess. The Dutch sketch of the Swan shows a projecting tiring-house and upon this projection Mr J. Le Gay Brereton builds an elaborate theory in a paper in the *Shakespeare Homage Book*.

In endorsing and elaborating Albright's theory of the carrying over of the principle of the front and the rear stage to the Restoration Picture-Stage theatres, Professor Thorndike has unfortunately given credence to a harmfully fallacious view of Restoration stage methods. Neither in stage direction or otherwise is there a tittle of evidence to show that either the Restoration dramatist or actor ever considered the stage from front to back otherwise than as a unit. The Picture-Stage, we must remember, was essentially of foreign origin and we cannot assume that its apron or *avant-scène* was a mere continuance of the front stage of the Elizabethan theatre in face of the fact that, on Algarotti's showing, the same feature was a characteristic of the early Italian opera-houses. Necessities of sight and hearing would have demanded its institution had the platform stage never existed. Professor Thorndike accepts the theory of alternation with reservations and urges the feasibility of the carrying-over of the principle to the early Picture-Stages. He maintains with Albright that acting in post-Restoration times was given alternately before and behind the curtain-line, and with him he seems to think that the illustrations in Settle's *Empress of Morocco* warrant the supposition that scenes could be run on immediately behind the proscenium opening. Undoubtedly these cuts give that impression, but if Professor Thorndike will examine the one he reproduces he will find that the entire scene cannot be taken as painted on a pair of front flats unless he is willing to admit that the two characters shown in the scene were painted on it also. As a matter of fact, at no period in the history of the English stage was it possible to set a scene immediately behind the curtain-line. Sir Christopher Wren's sectional design for the second Theatre Royal, Drury Lane (1672)[1], shows that no scene or section of a scene could have been set within several feet of the proscenium arch. Moreover the Restoration disposition of the wings and flats and their working was identical with the method employed by Inigo Jones in the Caroline masques, and Jones's *modus operandi* was widely divergent from the alternative scheme elaborately propounded by Professor Thorndike. The true method of Restoration scene-shifting has only been demonstrated by Robert W. Lowe in the second chapter of his *Thomas Betterton*.

In his section on 'Stage Presentation,' Professor Thorndike favours Albright's view that all propertied scenes were inner scenes, a specious theory which cannot even be maintained with regard to heavy properties.

[1] Reproduced in my article on 'What a Restoration Theatre was like' in *The Graphic* for June 14, 1913.

Examples abound where scaffolds were set up on the outer stage and banquets brought in. In *King Henry VIII*, I, 4, the tables are removed after the feast. Trees were not always set up on the inner stage as Professor Thorndike avers, nor were bed scenes invariably 'discoveries.' In all instances where the occupant of the bed had to speak, the bed was immediately thrust out and the other characters came on by the entering doors. To all intents and purposes scenes of this order were outer scenes. At pp. 131–2 Professor Thorndike clearly misinterprets Hieronymo's order. How could the title of the bye-play of *Solyman and Perseda* indicate the locality? The statement 'our scene is Rhodes' is merely supplementary information. A page later he confesses to a difficulty now and again in determining, when an interior room is represented, whether the upper stage or the lower inner stage is intended. Personally, I have never experienced any such difficulty. It may be safely taken that, where no indication occurs of characters entering 'aloft' or 'above' or drawing upper curtains, and especially where no conjunctive action occurs on the upper and lower stage, the scene was acted below. In a few instances where the directions have dropped out careful study of the text affords the necessary information. Thus in *Ram Alley*, a play in which much use is made of the upper stage, the characters on it in Act III are spoken of as being upstairs.

A good deal of the difficulty which Professor Thorndike encounters at various junctures would vanish into thin air if he would only recognise that the first two children's private playing-places were not considered in the category of theatres nor fitted up according to the accepted theatrical methods of the times. It is significant that the term 'private theatre' did not come into use until the seventeenth century, the earlier term being 'private house.' It is idle therefore to assume that the first two private playing-places had the normal tiring-house background of the public theatres or followed public theatre methods. This applies to Professor Thorndike's contentions in his chapter on 'The Court Theater in the reign of Elizabeth' (p. 161). His assumption that 'in the indoor theaters, the inner stage soon came into frequent employment' (p. 172) must accordingly remain discredited. Not only is it incapable of proof, but it is refuted by such meagre evidence as we possess. Stress is laid on the stage directions in *Love's Metamorphosis* regardless of the circumstance that the play has not come down to us in its original form. To recognise that the early children's playing-places were not considered regulation theatres is to recognise that they did not fall within the law. Here we have the reason why the Privy Council in its orders of June 22, 1600, and April 9, 1604, omitted mention of the Blackfriars and Paul's (pp. 236 and 240). How far Professor Thorndike has failed to grasp this is shown by his statement that 'the assumption under James I of complete control by the court was only the legal adoption of a practice virtually established' (p. 252). He even assigns to the children 'professional attributes.'

In his useful chapter on 'The Court Theater in the reigns of James I and Charles I' Professor Thorndike puts the cart before the horse in

stating that 'the masque is in many respects the forerunner of the opera.' Probably he was thinking only of English opera but both in its scenic extravagance and in its occasional employment of recitative the later Jacobean masque was inspired by the *dramma per musica*. What, one may ask, is the evidence for the occasional descent of the masquers by machines from the stage to the floor of the hall (p. 178)? This is surely a slip. In placing Jones's work at Oxford in August 1605, before his superintendence of the setting of *The Masque of Blackness* (January 4, 1604–5) Professor Thorndike gets two important events out of their chronological order. He assumes the use of the roller curtain in the Caroline masques, but a curtain that 'flew up' did not necessarily roll up; and, if the roller curtain found its way to England thus early, how comes it we have no trace of its employment in the London theatres until the middle of the eighteenth century? The prime necessity for original research is shown in this chapter where excessive credit is given to Inigo Jones as scenic inventor. Nearly all the devices employed by him had been derived from observation in Italy. Sabbatini demonstrates the principle of flats running in grooves, but is silent regarding the working of wings in a similar way. By changing his wings in the same manner as his flats Jones established the English system of scene-shifting, a system differing from all continental methods and which held its place in the English theatre until half a century ago. Beyond that he cannot rank as inventor. Professor Thorndike errs in including *Microcosmus* among the masques performed at court and has misconprehended its text in arriving at the conclusion that it did not call for shifting scenery.

One finds little to cavil at in the excellent chapter on 'Governmental Regulation.' A wrong impression is, however, given regarding *Believe as You List*, which, although at first refused a licence, was afterwards allowed to be acted. A facsimile of Herbert's ultimate licence, dated May 7, 1631, is given in the original edition of the play as published by the Percy Society. The intricate problem of theatrical finance, to which an entire chapter should have been devoted, is dealt with by Professor Thorndike in hole and corner fashion and none too satisfactorily. Often as it has been attacked by investigators since Malone's time, this vexed question has never been thoroughly threshed out. But, despite the fact that the most of those who have discussed it have only succeeded in adding to its complexities, its difficulties are not insuperable. Nowhere in Professor Thorndike's book is the distinction between sharers and housekeepers sharply defined. Both were really sharers though in different categories. The housekeepers—so called, I think, because they were responsible for ground-rent and repairs—were the capitalists of the concern and derived their pecuniary return by way of interest on investments. The sharers were the principal players of the theatre and were given a certain division of the receipts in unequal proportions in lieu of wages. At first all the housekeepers were non-professionals, but subsequently as the players prospered they invested money in the theatres. Professor Thorndike takes a wholly erroneous view in stating

(p. 349) that 'when with a few other members of the company, he [Shakespeare] was *given* shares [i.e. became a housekeeper] in the Globe, and later in the Blackfriars, we must again consider these profitable transactions as recognitions of his great value to the company.' We cannot consider them anything of the sort. Save where an interest in a theatre was derived by bequeathal it is unthinkable that any person could have become a housekeeper otherwise than by purchase. An approximation to the price is yielded by the terms charged to the housekeepers by Alleyn in connection with the second Fortune, viz. £41. 13*s*. 4*d*. besides rental. In pursuit of his theory of the Burbages' gift to their five leading actors at the Globe, Professor Thorndike writes, 'apparently some agreement was made by which a sharer on death or withdrawal from the company was to transfer his share back to the other housekeepers' (p. 309), and he then goes on to point out that on Kemp's withdrawal his share was so transferred. But Hemings was one of the original housekeepers and his will shows that his share did not so revert. So, too, with Condell. It is more feasible to conclude that the Burbages on proceeding to build the Globe in part with the materials of the demolished Theater were cramped for capital and conceived the idea of binding their principal players to the new house by selling them shares in the concern.

Professor Thorndike conveys a wrong impression in stating (p. 260) that 'Shakespeare, for example, drew his income as part owner (or lessee) of two playhouses, as a shareholder in the company, as a playwright, as an actor, and perhaps also as a stage manager or for some other services.' Possibly by 'shareholder in the company' he means 'housekeeper' but the term simply implies 'actor-sharer,' making the subsequent 'as an actor' superfluous. Moreover Shakespeare could not have derived an extra income as stage-manager for the very good reason that that particular official was the outcome of a much later specialization of function. In Elizabethan times the duties of the stage-manager were shared by the prompter and the stage-keeper.

Professor Thorndike recognises that 'certain playwrights, as Heywood, Shakespeare, Fletcher, and in a later period Dryden, were regularly attached to one company, presumably under some form of contract.' Later on he hazards the conjecture that Shakespeare, in binding himself to write solely for the King's men 'received an extra share in the proceeds, or a fixed sum for a play.' Neither surmise is correct. In Brome's time the stock dramatist of the theatre contracted to supply a certain number of plays per year for a weekly salary of thirty or forty shillings (deducted from the daily charges of the house) plus the profits of the third performance of each new play. Similar contracts were made after the Restoration, the stipulation usually being for three plays a year. How far back this system dated is a subject for future inquiry; but there can be little doubt that it was the system under which Shakespeare worked for the King's men.

A few infelicities of expression mar Professor Thorndike's lucid, agreeable style. On pp. 151 and 314 the application of the term

'theaters' to inn-yard playing-places jars. At the latter reference it were better to use the phrasing of the draft and say 'their usual houses.' On p. 342 the sentence beginning 'two or three years' is not a little ugly. How could a play, viewed purely as an actable commodity, be a 'lasting sale'? A few slips and misprints are to be noted. Page 48, l. 5, for *Morton* read *Martin*; p. 59, l. 19, *open* should be *empty*; p. 178, l. 12, for *masques* read *masquers*; p. 185, l. 19, 'on...ledges' should be 'in...sieges'; p. 204, l. 8, for *1872* read *1572*.

W. J. Lawrence.

Dublin.

A Tale of a Tub by Ben Jonson. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By Florence May Snell. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1915. 8vo. xxiii + 205 pp.

This edition was presented as a thesis for the doctorate at Yale University, and Dr Snell explains that the Yale library 'offered exceptional resources for a more detailed study of the text than had yet been made,' and further that 'in many instances' her views upon the play are 'quite different from those previously brought forward.' She thus fixes the standard by which she invites us to test her contribution to scholarship.

First, as to text. She reprints the Folio of 1640 from the Yale library copy, collating it with a copy in private hands and recording the variants of two other copies used by Dr Scherer.

> From the conditions in *A Tale of a Tub* as it appears in these four folios, it may be inferred that there were at least four imprints of the second volume of the 1640 folio. It is impossible to tell in what order they occurred.

The 'conditions' are simply a small number of misprints corrected according to a common practice of the time while the sheets of the work were passing through the press. It is now a matter of common knowledge—or, if not, it should at any rate be a matter of special knowledge with editors—that the printer did not throw away faulty sheets, which were thus distributed over a number of copies at pure haphazard by the binder. This occurred in issuing *A Tale of a Tub*, and the variants are easily grouped into two classes—misprints and press corrections. Dr Snell sees this, judging from a comment on page viii, but she does not draw the natural inference, and she closes her slight discussion of the question with a reference to the 'note on 3. 5. 61,' which has no note.

A collation of her text with the Folio reveals a number of additional variants, to which she does not call attention. Some of these attribute such gross incompetence to the original printer that I thought it imperative to have the reprint checked with the Yale copy which it aims at reproducing. By the courtesy of a friend, who has examined

the doubtful passages for me, I am able to make the following corrections:

	Reprint.	Yale Copy.
II i 39	*Med.*	*Mad.*
II ii 4–6	(*Printed as prose*)	(*Printed as verse*)
II iii 25	I 'looke	I looke
II vi 17	that which tormenteth	that which most tormenteth
III iii 17	pursue	prusue
III vii 26	new maid Purs'yvant	new made Purs'yvant
III viii 2	over-rearch'd	over-reach'd
IV i 33	'was told	't was told
IV i 84	And hgive	And give
IV i 97	chenge	change
IV ii 31	legs a of lackey	legs of a lackey
V vi 13	our Daughter	your Daughter
V vii 32	Cutlet	Cutler
V x 68	sohe	so he

There are also a number of errors in the punctuation. A form like 'hgive' is a monstrous coinage to father upon an innocent printer, and to overlook this mistake in the proof-reading is inexcusable[1]. Such a text cannot be trusted; and further, Dr Snell has made no attempt to deal with the bibliographical problem of the play—its place in the oddly printed Folio, and its anonymous printer.

In the introduction and notes I have not found the 'many instances' in which Dr Snell differs from her predecessors. The notes 'include whatever has been thought valuable in previous editions,' and add to these, often in an elementary way. There is a note on 'Hue and Cry': '*NED.*: An outcry calling for the pursuit of a felon, raised by the party aggrieved, by a constable, etc.' A man is called 'a spaniel': the note is 'Because of a docile, timid, affectionate disposition.' But of really original matter, or elucidations of unsolved difficulties (such as 'Vadian,' III vi 26), there is hardly a trace. The one contribution which Dr Snell has made to the study of *A Tale of a Tub* is contained in Section B of her introduction—'The Date of the Play'—in which she examines or summarises previous theories and herself decides that the play is late, that it 'was all written at about the same time,' and that it 'stands...where its licensing in 1633 puts it, as Jonson's last work for the stage.'

This revolutionary result is reached largely by a study of the metre. Working out a hint of Professor Saintsbury that 'Jonson took much more liberty with the number of syllables in his later than in his earlier plays,' she compiles statistics, showing the percentage of extra syllables within the line. The percentage rises from 2·5 in *The Case is Altered*, 5 in the first draft of *Every Man in his Humour*, 4·5 in *Every Man out of his Humour*, and 4 in *Cynthia's Revels* to 24 in *The Staple of News*, 24·8 in *The Magnetic Lady*, and 24·6 in *A Tale of a Tub*. The looser and more fluid line of Jonson's later work was probably influenced

[1] Compare the Glossary (p. 188)—'*Though*, *a.* Study, 1. 1. 43.' This ought to be '*Tough*...Sturdy.'

by the verse of Fletcher, and the proportion of such lines in the latest play is striking. Dr Snell has proved that in 1633 Jonson reworked a larger portion of the text than editors or critics have supposed.

But the suggestion that the entire play was written at this late date remains unproved. In her eagerness to maintain a novel theory, the editor has ignored all the evidence which is hostile to it. Even the verse does not uniformly support her view. Quite a number of passages can be quoted which are characteristic early work: here is one:

> See, how his love doth melt him into Teares!
> An honest faithfull servant is a Jewell.
> Now th' adventurous Squire hath time, and leisure,
> To aske his *Awdrey* how she do's, and heare
> A gratefull answer from her. Shee not speakes:
> Hath the proud Tiran, Frost, usurp'd the seate
> Of former beauty in my Loves faire cheek:
> Staining the roseat tincture of her blood,
> With the dull die of blew-congealing cold?
> No, sure the weather dares not so presume
> To hurt an object of her brightnesse. Yet,
> The more I view her, she but lookes so, so.
> Ha? gi' me leave to search this mysterie! (II iv 47–59.)

To read this passage aloud is fatal to statistics. The verse has the movement of Jonson's early work; the style is early too. *The Case is Altered* and the Quarto text of *Every Man in his Humour* have passages tinged with the same faint colouring of the romantic manner. The notes actually quote as a parallel

> She never told her love,
> But let concealment, like a worm i' the bud,
> Feed on her damask cheek.

That is very unkind to Jonson.

To the occasional evidence of style and verse must be added the characterisation and the plot, suggestive throughout of Jonson's earlier manner before he narrowed down his conception of drama to a systematic study of the humours. Chanon Hugh, the arch-contriver of the intrigue, is a cruder and earlier Brain-worm; he lacks just that intellectual element which first appears in Brain-worm and reaches its consummate development in Subtle, Face, and Mosca. In-and-In Medlay, the cooper of Islington, on whom Jonson grafted later his grotesque attempt to belittle Inigo Jones, is another obstacle to the new theory. No notice is taken of him in the section of the introduction devoted to 'Critical Comment.' But he shows clear signs of patching; in the first three acts he is a blundering Middlesex yokel—see especially his lumbering attempt to recover the word 'warrant,' which he has forgotten (III i 30–8)—then he suddenly emerges as 'Architectonicus professor,' reproduces the mannerisms and bad Latin of Inigo Jones, and flounders through the last scene with an inane caricature of the masque. The metamorphosis is so clumsily managed that we can detect the seams of the piecing. Would Jonson, even in

his days of broken health and declining power, have committed such a lapse if the entire play were new? The old view is, in the main, sound: failure in technique and incongruity of characterisation then become intelligible.

PERCY SIMPSON.

OXFORD.

Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, 1700–1725. Edited by WILLARD HIGLEY DURHAM. 8vo. Newhaven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1915. xliv + 445 pp.

This is the first instalment of a work which is eventually to cover the two following quarter-centuries, and to be supplemented by a separate study on 'the development of literary criticism and popular taste in the eighteenth century.' As it is presumably meant to continue the work of Gregory Smith and Spingarn in their *Elizabethan Critical Essays* and *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* respectively, it will be not unfair to compare it with these.

Dr Durham's book consists of a brief introduction; reprints of treatises and selections from Gildon (3), Hughes (3), Dennis (3), Farquhar (1), Steele (2), Addison (4), Pope (1), Welsted (1), and Ramsay (1); brief notes; and a bibliography. His purposes in writing the book are enunciated on its detachable cover: (i) the recovery of some interesting critical essays, (ii) the vindication of the criticism of the period from several false charges, and (iii) a sketch of the tendencies 'which did in fact mark the period.' An unacknowledged and occasional purpose seems to have been—and this is a different matter entirely—a defence of the critical attitude of the time.

His first difficulty is one which did not confront Gregory Smith and Spingarn; his material is much more extensive than is theirs, and so he must make a selection. For scholars, the most valuable selection would undoubtedly have been a reprint of the most inaccessible material: but Dr Durham does not seem to have been able to decide whether he was writing for the specialist or for the 'reader of average information,' and he compromises by attempting to supply the wants of the 'student.' The volume is to present the 'more significant' criticism, and 'representative' quality in the selection is to be attained by the introduction of snippets from Addison and Pope's *Preface to the Translation of the Iliad*. Palpably this is inadequate representation, and we would willingly have sacrificed the attempt at representation in return for a few of those rare treatises which Dr Durham mentions in his bibliography.

As the author tells us that editorial matter of all kinds has been sacrificed to a greater body of text, perhaps the only point we ought to criticise is the choice of material: for the chosen essays are carefully and exactly reprinted from original editions or from editions revised by the author. But we feel constrained to go further, for Dr Durham is

continuing his work, and what editorial matter there is here is so unsatisfactory that some comment is demanded.

Our misgivings are aroused by the whole of the Introduction, they become clamorous when we reach the Notes, and they are only partly soothed by the extensive Bibliography. Dr Durham seemed to be in a dilemma as to his audience when he chose his selections; what sort of people he is addressing in the Introduction it is impossible to say. He has created an ideally ignorant reader who believes that 'Alexander Pope, aided and abetted by servile followers, foisted upon the meek British public a hide-bound and pedantic theory of poetry' (p. xi), and 'other such silly stuff': but he includes in this fictitious reader's ignorance the belief that 'Queen Anne critics cherished a pathetic devotion to the Rules' (p. x), and the equally ignorant and 'misleading' supposition that theories were dominant during this period 'which carried admiration of the ancients to the point of idolatry' and which held 'that emotion in poetry should be kept in strict subjection to reason and common sense' (p. xii). All this 'ignorance' Dr Durham proceeds to dissipate by his enunciation of the 'fairly obvious facts' (be it noted) that these opinions are ungrounded assumptions, that 'Addison and Steele in so far as they fit in any pigeon-holes belong with the romanticists,' and (apparently—or at least in places) that neo-classicism does not exist in this period, and that neo-classicism is one of the healthiest qualities of the period. At least, this is what we gather, for although 'it is misleading to say that such theories as these [the two specifically classic tenets we have quoted immediately above] were dominant in the period with which we are concerned' (p. xii), yet 'in the England of this period what we have called the classic tendency was dominant' (p. xliii), and 'the basic attitude remained' the same (p. xliii) as that of the preceding century, which is the one to go to 'for the really thorough-going classicist or rationalist in criticism' (p. xi).

The inconsistency is further to be seen by comparing Dr Durham's general summary of the criticism of the period with his separate remarks on the particular critics. His longest extracts are from Gildon, Hughes, and Dennis—these then presumably are fairly representative. With Gildon, '*as commonly elsewhere*, rationalism is another name for crude dogmatism'; Hughes 'may not be a critic of extraordinary insight, he may even be a "mediocrist"'; '*and yet* Dennis' theory is not absurd,' though '*naturally* many of his conclusions are *hopelessly* inconclusive, much of his theory of poetry *totally* unpoetic' (our italics). Further still, both Gildon and Dennis, as they grow older, become more and more unbending in their support of what most authorities are agreed in calling generally 'Classical' theories. But let anyone whisper Eighteenth Century Classicism or Critical Orthodoxy to Dr Durham, and he is at once accused of the 'original sin of criticism.'

We believe Dr Durham's *imbroglio* to be due to a somewhat slipshod method and a superficial view. He has a real and partly

unconscious facility for trying to rid himself of troublesome facts. Addison applied the Rules of Aristotle and Le Bossu to examine *Paradise Lost* and *Chevy Chace*: not as you would imagine, because he gave a general approval to those Rules, but because 'he liked the poem and wanted to make others like it, and so tried to show them how it had in it some of the qualities they liked in poems with which they were already familiar' (p. xxxvi). The exculpation of Pope proceeds in similar fashion: Pope wrote an *Essay on Criticism*, we have also his reported conversations with Spence, and from both these sources you may have concluded that he was a neo-classic; but you cannot set any store by what a child writes, though that child be such a precocious genius as Pope, and so the *Essay on Criticism* must be discarded as a 'source of misinformation'; and as for the reports in Spence, his 'remarks were often made in rashness or peevishness and remembered by chance.' Such is the way of Dr Durham, when it is not even more fatal. The result is that he seems to have an entirely fallacious conception of the whole scope of Classical criticism.

The example of his predecessors might have helped him to a larger attitude. He has limited himself entirely to English criticism: when he needs to refer casually to the growth of Classical theories, he invents a disingenuous evolution for the purpose (p. xv). But he never tries to see English criticism as historically and organically one branch of the system of European criticism: indeed he seems at times to conceive of the English theories as evolving themselves entirely in this island, whereas both in spirit and in detail there probably never was any system of thought and practices more completely and entirely derived from foreign sources. To the non-scientific man there is nothing in common between a diamond and a piece of charcoal: he notes the superficial differences and misses the substantial identity. Dr Durham seems to be in a similar predicament when he attacks us for our ignorance and belief in the general orthodoxy of eighteenth-century criticism. Ignoring the fundamental unity, he fixes his attention on differences in detail; and so his categories are generally based on nothing more than the presence or absence of phenomenally or nominally similar details; for instance, an absolute recognition of the rules is presumably the mark of a species differing entirely from that which allows but the slightest doubt of their full authority.

This narrowness or superficiality in the point of view may be traced in the omissions from Dr Durham's Notes, and these omissions, we believe, point to the insecure basis of his Introduction. The Notes of Gregory Smith and Spingarn are replete with illustrative quotations from earlier English, French and Italian critics, and with further extensive references to the body of European criticism, so that we see the whole system in due proportions. Dr Durham only mentions foreign critics when an explicit quotation in the text compels him to give the reference, he never quotes illustrative parallel passages from them, although the English critics of his period even more than those of the earlier ones are incessantly shouting aloud the names of the

prophets and legislators of their creed. Again, both Gregory Smith and Spingarn realise that for even a tolerable understanding of any literary theory, it is necessary to fix the exact meaning at different periods of the traditional technical terms such as Genius, Taste, Gusto, Imagination, Wit, etc.—and they meet this requirement by supplying us with the necessary material in their Notes. Annotation of this really valuable kind Dr Durham does not give us at all: indeed he hardly realises the need for it, preferring apparently to have us take a term, read into it its modern connotation, and then agree to those dubious conclusions which make up the body of the Introduction, and are especially disturbing when stated as 'obvious facts.' Let us refer to one instance alone. It concerns the basing of Pope's general critical theory on his making Invention a criterion of the relative merit of Homer. We put on one side the apparent unfairness of neglecting entirely the whole drift of the *Essay on Criticism*; we pass by the fact that, even to Dr Durham, the other criteria in this particular treatise on Homer are predominantly 'classical,' or 'rational' (though again he tries to save himself by asserting that 'Pope cared too little for such matters to investigate them,' etc.). We are content to take him on the one point alone: and we submit (i) that he is unjustified in separating Pope from neo-classical theorists on the ground of his assertion of the first importance of Invention, and (ii) that he is unjustified in assuming that the term Invention in eighteenth-century criticism is synonymous with what we mean by 'poetic imagination.' Let us take these points in order.

(i) Pope's special *dictum* is to be found in Cicero, *De Inventione*, l. 1, c. 9, 'quare inventio, quae princeps est omnium partium'; in Ronsard, *Abrégé* (Gregory Smith, I, 359), 'car le principal poinct est l'invention; in Castelvetro, *Poetica d'Aristotele*, p. 78, 'la quale inventione è la più difficile cosa che habbia il poeta da fare, e dalla qual parte pare che egli prenda il nome'; in Gascoigne, *Certain Notes* (Gregory Smith, I, 48), 'the rule of invention, which of all other rules is most to be marked'; and it has the explicit approval of Dryden himself (see quotation in next paragraph).

(ii) Some light will be thrown on the connotation of the term 'invention' by a few cogent occurrences of it. In Cicero's *De Inventione*, l. 1, c. 9, it is one of the five parts of oratory, 'inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, pronuntiatio' [cf. also *De Orat.*, l. 1, c. 31, and l. 2, c. 19], and is defined as 'excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium, quae causam probabilem reddant'; but in the sequel, it seems to cover literary ordonnance in general. And this tendency is more clearly seen in the apocryphal *Ad Herennium*, l. 1, c. 2 and 3, where we are told 'inventio in sex partes orationis consumitur, in exordium, narrationem, divisionem, confirmationem, confutationem, conclusionem.' In Quintilian, *Instit.*, l. 10, c. 1, § 106, 'concilium, ordinem, dividendi, praeparandi, probandi rationem, omnia denique quae sunt Inventionis,' 'invention' connotes mainly literary design and arrangement. So the word passes from the art of rhetoric to what in all 'classical' times is very similar,

the art of poetry, with a traditional meaning and tendency quite different from what we now imply by 'poetic imagination.' And moreover, these traditions of classical theory and scholarship were precisely those which eighteenth-century critics cherished. Thus the word 'invention' is used exactly in Quintilian's sense by Rapin in his *Comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero*[1], 'The design of the Discourse, the Order, Division, and Arguments, and all that any way depend on the Invention.' Dryden had previously used 'invention' to signify the most intellectual (and hence the most formal, and to a 'classic' the most important) aspect of imagination: 'the first happiness of the poet's imagination is properly invention, *or finding of thought*' (*Pref. Ann. Mirab.*)—an extract which helps us to understand one appeal of 'invention' to classic critics in general and not only to Pope.

It seems then that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 'invention' was used most usually in reference to the mode of composition, either to the ordonnance and design of the material or to its classification as fictitious or historic. But in any case the main eye was on technique; and the supreme importance which the neo-classic critic assigns to 'invention' is really identical with Aristotle's stress on plot or fable. It will be obvious how far removed the common eighteenth-century meaning is from the modern conception of imagination: and even where the eighteenth-century 'invention' refers specially to the faculty and so to some small extent approaches our 'imagination,' it is still the faculty of composition and not the faculty of creation: it still implies no more than skill in the art, *ingegno a trovare*, and whether that skill is an endowment of nature or an acquisition by knowledge and experience is not a fundamental issue, for in both cases it operates in accordance with knowable laws with mechanic regularity. 'Invention' said Sir Joshua Reynolds in his *Discourses* 'is little more than a new combination of those images which have been previously gathered and deposited in the memory.' Pope and Addison may talk at large of imagination and of invention, but these words have no absolute value, and their particular implication is always relative to their context in the literary and philosophic tradition of the day. To that tradition, the creative, shaping spirit of imagination was totally unknown: and of this, the mere mention of Locke is immediate proof positive.

So we believe Dr Durham's interpretation to be unjustified, and by consequence, the theory he bases on it. Despite Dr Durham, 'invention' in the eighteenth century does seem to suggest a mechanical conception somewhat as Leslie Stephen had in mind when he declared that 'the use of the word "invention" implies that Pope thought of Homer as working out his poem in some such manner as a skilled

[1] *The Whole Critical Works of Monsieur Rapin*, 2 vols., London, 1706, vol. I, p. 92. Dr Durham omits this collection from his bibliography, despite Rapin's enormous critical influence, and despite the fact that it reprints Rymer's translation of and preface to Rapin's *Réflexions sur la Poëtique d'Aristote*, and so is evidence of the continued influence of both these 'thorough-going classicist or rationalist' critics.

mechanic works out some problem which may lead to an improvement in an engine' (p. xxxiii).

But our immediate point is not whether Leslie Stephen or Dr Durham or neither is right. Our point is that it is unscholarly to dispense with investigation and simply assume the meaning of a technical term, especially when on that assumed meaning a more or less revolutionary thesis is based; it is worse when, on the same basis, an acknowledged scholar like Leslie Stephen, whose authority is not to be controverted by a mere assumption, is bluntly accused of malice. And Dr Durham's Notes give us not the slightest help to investigations of this nature, an omission of capital moment. He must imitate the thoroughness of his predecessors and supply much more detailed evidence for the truth of his views before he claims authority for 'vindicating the Age of Anne from false charges.'

Dr Durham's work as an editor is seen to most advantage in his excellent Bibliography; to which we can only object that the titles of the books are sometimes too severely clipped. His Notes are generally helpful, but, as we have tried to show above, very seldom in what is after all the main issue, the study of literary theory. We should like, however, to have been told if Welsted ever did get the 'Opportunity of publishing some Thoughts, I have by me, on Dramatic Writing' (p. 377), for their absence from the Bibliography is not conclusive, as Dr Durham's system omits all publications after 1725, and Welsted lived on to 1747. We are told the source of the 'long quotation' which begins on page 62, but there is nothing either in the text or the Notes to indicate where the quotation ends. It extends to 'the Profitable' (p. 72).

Dr Durham deserves our thanks for carefully reprinting several interesting treatises in a handy and easily accessible form. But we regret we cannot regard this volume as a satisfactory addition to the series, nor at all endorse the statements made on the publisher's cover that Dr Durham's 'is a constructive work marked by a scholarship and a knowledge of his subject which inspires his readers with a confidence in the justice of his conclusions.'

H. B. Charlton.

Manchester.

William Wordsworth: His Life, Works and Influence. By G. M. Harper. 2 vols. London: John Murray. 1916. 8vo. xi + 892 pp.

Mr Harper's *Wordsworth* has appeared at the right moment: *felix opportunitate nativitatis.* At no time has the fame of Wordsworth stood so high as it does at present. Never before has the twofold character of his genius been so clearly realised: the strain of the *Cuckoo* and the *Lines above Tintern* so plainly seen to be inseparable from that of *The Happy Warrior* and the Sonnets of Liberty and Independence, with such poems as *Michael* and *The Ruined Cottage* for the connecting link between them.

To the many who, under the present storm, have found refuge and strength in the 'healing power' and the unshaken courage of the great poet, these records of his 'life and influence' will be of enthralling interest. Not that Wordsworth has hitherto been so ill-served in this matter as is sometimes supposed. The *Memoirs* published by his nephew, the late Bishop of Lincoln, immediately after his death—if allowance be made for the author's manifest desire to press a free and inspired genius into the service of a particular creed and a particular Church system, and for his suppression of vital facts which might have interfered with the general acceptance of his pious portrait—have considerable value: if only because they quote freely from the best record of a great poet's daily life which has ever been given, the *Journals* written by Dorothy during the seminal years of Alfoxden and Grasmere. Professor Knight again, both by his Life and still more by his publication of the *Journals* and family letters, laboured stoutly in the cause. Finally, in M. Legouis' *Jeunesse de Wordsworth* we have a literary and biographical study of the growth of the young poet's mind which is altogether beyond price.

Mr Harper, himself a pupil of M. Legouis, is loud in praise of his master's work. And this is the more generous as, in retracing the ground of *La jeunesse*—especially that crucial part of it which covers the year spent by the poet in revolutionary France—he was manifestly and consciously working at a disadvantage. On the whole, however, it must be said that he has shown much skill and judgment in meeting this and other difficulties and that, as an account of the *whole* life of the poet, no book approaches this in excellence. And if in what follows it is necessary to lay stress upon what seem the weaker spots in Mr Harper's performance, this, which is the deliberate opinion of the reviewer, must be constantly borne in mind.

The defects of the book may be reduced to two: an insufficiency in the author's treatment of the new and exceedingly important matter which he has brought to light concerning Wordsworth's youth; and the immoderate stress he lays upon the 'fossilisation,' the narrowing of intellectual and political sympathies, which befell him long before he reached old age.

The former matter is something of a long story. Mr Harper has discovered—or, if not that, he is the first writer explicitly to recognise—a fact which goes to the very root of Wordsworth's character as it was in the crucial period of its growth. During his sojourn in France, the young poet fell in love with a girl who seems to have lived in the neighbourhood of Blois and by her had a daughter, Caroline, who must have been born either in 1792 or the following year: in the latter case, after the father's enforced return to England, which took place certainly not later than the middle of January 1793, and probably in December 1792. He remained in constant correspondence, and probably in occasional communication, with the mother, Annette Vallon, until 1802, when he visited Calais, shortly before his own marriage, apparently with the express purpose of meeting both

mother and daughter[1]. He provided some kind of a dowry on Caroline's marriage, which was planned for 1815 but which, owing to the untimely reappearance of Napoleon at the critical moment, did not actually take place until the following year; and at the earlier date he had arranged to be represented at it by his sister Dorothy and his wife's sister, Sara Hutchinson. His last recorded sight both of mother and daughter was on a visit to Paris, in company with his wife and Crabb Robinson, in 1820.

These are the facts, so far as Mr Harper brings definite evidence on the matter. He suggests—but it is merely a surmise—that marriage may have been prohibited by Annette's parents, who are thought to have been royalists and who, if so, may not unnaturally have disliked to see their daughter united to a struggling, unknown foreigner who was also a republican and a protestant, if not a free-thinker or an 'atheist.' But whether the marriage was proposed before, or after, the original fault had been committed, whether the objection to it came also from the side of Wordsworth's family or no, whether indeed it was ever proposed at all—these are matters of pure conjecture; or rather, if they are known to anyone now living, the knowledge has been studiously withheld from the world at large.

No man with a decent respect for human frailty, or a just knowledge of his own weakness, will dream of passing judgment upon Wordsworth for the original fault. What it really concerns us to know is: What was the spirit in which he met the obligations which his own act had brought upon him? what sacrifices did he make with a view to shielding mother and child from some at least of the evils for which he —in part, at least, and probably for the greater part—was responsible? Were the obstacles to marriage in very deed insurmountable? or did he allow himself to be put off by difficulties which courage and resolution might have broken down?

To none of these questions does Mr Harper give even the semblance of an answer. The fault is not his. It must be thrown back upon the author of the original *Memoirs* of Wordsworth's life, who seems to have deliberately suppressed all the facts bearing upon this episode of his uncle's history and to whom much information, now in all probability lost beyond recovery, must have been accessible. It is possible, indeed, that he may have been acting under instructions either from Wordsworth himself, or from his widow. If so, he was undoubtedly in a cruel position. But the plain truth is that, if all the crucial facts of the poet's life were not to be published, no *Memoirs* ought to have been written at all. In these cases, it is a question of all, or nothing. And the publication of the *Memoirs*, without any mention of what for at least ten years must have been a main factor in the life of the poet and of his whole bearing towards the outer world, is a peculiarly flagrant example of the insincerity, the wholesale betrayal of the first elements of candour, which has been the bane of biography in this country from

[1] The sonnet, 'It is a beauteous evening, calm and free,' then written, is addressed to Caroline.

the beginning. Carlyle made a noble protest against this evil practice in his review of Lockhart's *Life of Scott*. But the biographers have continued to follow it and readers have continued to accept, and even to applaud, it from that day to this.

That the Bishop of Lincoln was well aware of the facts, is perfectly certain. Knowing what we now know, it is impossible to read what he says of the poet's residence in France without seeing this at a glance: 'Wordsworth's condition in France was a very critical one: he was an orphan, young, inexperienced, impetuous, enthusiastic, with no friendly voice to guide him, in a foreign country, and that country in a state of revolution; and this revolution, it must be remembered, had not only taken up arms against the monarchy and other ancient institutions, but had declared war against Christianity. The most licentious theories were propounded; all restraints were broken; libertinism was law. He was encompassed with strong temptations; and although it is not the design of the present work to chronicle the events of his life except so far as they illustrate his writings, yet I could not pass over this period of it without noticing the dangers which surround those who in an ardent emotion of enthusiasm put themselves in a position of peril without due consideration of the circumstances which ought to regulate their practice[1].'

If this is not a hint, and a pretty broad one, that Wordsworth's 'practice' was 'licentious,' it is mere idle talk. The wonder is that we were all so blind as not to see this long ago. To put ourselves off with the plea that it is merely a clerical amplification of the 'war against Christianity declared by the Revolution' and accepted at that time (though in no aggressive sense) by the poet, is to do an injustice to the Bishop's head. His head was in the right place. Whether the same thing can be said of his heart, is another matter. Can it be honestly maintained that it was candid to speak of the poet 'entering on his mission and his ministry[2]' when the biographer was all the time concealing facts which would have caused many persons—most unjustly, no doubt, and absurdly—to deny his claim to any mission or ministry whatsoever?

It may be said that the Bishop explicitly disclaims the title of 'biographer'; that, in a rather embarrassed 'introductory chapter,' he pleads that his uncle's works are his true life, and that it would therefore be 'a superfluous and presumptuous enterprise to encroach upon their province and to invade the biographical eminence on which his Poems stand[3].' Accordingly, it is not as a biography but as *Memoirs*—as 'a biographical commentary on the Poet's works'—that the Bishop wishes his volumes to be judged.

This, no doubt, is the excuse with which the Bishop, who was otherwise a man of very scrupulous conscience, strove to satisfy himself. But can it be reckoned satisfactory? Can it be denied that his words meant one thing to himself, who was in the secret, and were bound to

[1] *Memoirs*, I, pp. 74–5. [2] *Ib.* p. 2. [3] *Ib.*

mean quite another to his readers, who were not? And, with no desire to bear hardly upon a man who was plainly under a dire temptation to baulk the truth out of respect both for the living and the dead, it is difficult to acquit him of prevarication: a prevarication all the more insidious, because it is executed with consummate skill.

All these mists are dispelled by a few plain words from Mr Harper. And, so far, nothing could be better. The disappointing thing is that, having found the truth, he should show so little desire to make use of it. This incident in Wordsworth's life is a new fact to him, but it is nothing more. It may flit across his pages from time to time, under date of letters received from Annette; but, to judge from these volumes it had no more influence than the man in the moon upon the poet's life. That it should have any bearing upon his character, or leave any trace upon his way of thought and, very possibly, upon his subsequent actions, seems never to have crossed the mind of his biographer. Yet this surely is the one thing that matters.

It may be objected that, by the reticence of those concerned and the spite of time, all such traces are now irrecoverably lost. And, if details only were in question, that is unfortunately too true. But, after all, details are only signs and symbols; it is the spiritual process, and not the word or deed which brings it to our sight or hearing, that ultimately counts. Given, then, the facts as brought to light by Mr Harper; given also our knowledge on the one hand of Wordsworth's nature as revealed in his life and written word and, on the other, of the manner in which a spirit, deep and noble as his, habitually works; is it impossible that we should frame to ourselves some notion of what this unhappy love-story ought to mean in our judgment of his character, of what it meant to the man himself during the years when it was a vital part of his experience, of the mingled joy and sorrow which he was daily called upon to face? At any rate, to fail in that attempt is better than never to have made it; and it will be something to have recognised the problem, even though any full solution of it is no longer within reach.

The first thing to strike us in the whole story is the passionate strain it reveals in the nature of Wordsworth: a strain which has often been spoken of, but of which, until these facts were made known, it was hard to offer any tangible proof. Full of self-reliance and plunged in a whirlpool where the old landmarks had been swept out of sight and the old canons had lost much of their restraining power, it may readily be believed that a youth of this nature, conscious of his own purity of motive, should without questioning have surrendered himself to a passion which seemed to hold 'so much of heaven' and which could not be stifled without certain pain alike to himself and to another, without possible starvation to all that was best and deepest in her heart as well as in his own.

It was this, doubtless, that gave Wordsworth so deep a sympathy with those who had fallen victims to their own passions and to others'. It was with the consciousness of this behind him that, in the first flowering-time of his genius, he wrote such poems as *The Thorn* and

The forsaken Indian Woman, as *Ruth* or that 'Somersetshire Tragedy,' the story of which was told to the present writer more than forty years ago, but which inexplicable scruples on the part of the poet's representatives still withhold from publication. Frankly, there has been too much prudery in the handling both of Wordsworth's life and of his poems. It is devoutly to be hoped that an end may now be put to it for ever.

Of the published poems above mentioned, *Ruth* is by far the most significant, though we must not exclude the possibility that, as Mr Harper suggests, a poem of a very different sort, *Vaudracour and Julia*, is a pale reflection, with the parts inverted, of the story of William and Annette. *Ruth*, however, is a poem apart. Not only is it conceived throughout in a more idealising temper than any of the earlier poems in question; but, under a now transparent veil, it gives us the spirit of the youthful poet as it was when he stood face to face with the Revolution. In the 'youth from Georgia's shore'—the

> Youth to whom was given
> So much of earth, so much of heaven,
> And such impetuous blood

—it is impossible not to see a darkened image of Wordsworth himself, as we now know him: wilful, passionate, in deep though half unconscious revolt against 'the meagre, stale, forbidding ways Of custom, law and statute'; more 'kindled' than 'restrained' by the keenly felt forces which surrounded him not only 'in earth and heaven, in glade and bower,' but also, and still more, in the field of heroic action which daily unrolled itself before his eyes:

> Before him shone a glorious world,
> Fresh as a banner bright, unfurled
> To music suddenly.
> He looked upon the hills and plains
> And seemed as if let loose from chains,
> To live at liberty[1].

This is one side of the picture: the passionate upheaval of a strong nature, stirred to its depths by a first love and a first intuition of the miracles to be wrought by human brotherhood; an upheaval which made a new heaven and a new earth for the youth who, from this double experience, learned for the first time the full meaning of the claim that 'man is born free' and recognised at the same moment that it was his lot to witness, perhaps to aid in, the stoutest blow ever struck for the recovery of that birthright.

The other side of the picture is no less significant. It is the sleepless self-control which, when once the first sweep of the storm was passed, enabled him to stand firm against every prompting of weakness from within and every discouragement that the wreck of his civic hopes might but too easily have fastened upon him from without. It was

[1] The Bishop of Lincoln, who knew the truth from the first, was not slow to point out the resemblance. *Memoirs*, I, p. 73.

always evident that, through the fiery trial of the Revolution and the Napoleonic tyranny, he kept a saner judgment, as well as a more heroic temper, than any man in this country, probably than any save a very small remnant in the whole of Europe. We now know that, during the first half of this period, his inner life must have been one of constant struggle both against vain remorse for what he had done rashly in the past and against fresh outbreaks of the same passionate impulse in the present.

With a deep and brooding nature like his, this is none the less certain because it is only to be divined. There are, however, various recorded facts which cannot be fully explained unless the insistent pressure of this personal sorrow and this personal struggle is present to our mind. Who has not felt that the poet's own account of the discouragement and weariness which fell upon him after his return from France needs some further explanation? And is not this supplied, when we know that, over and above his very just cause of public sorrow and public indignation, he was also suffering under a cruel personal bereavement and an abiding consciousness of wrong done by himself, however unintentionally, to others? The former motive is not to be belittled—to do so would be to misunderstand some of the deepest springs of his nature—but it requires the addition of the other motive —or rather, complication of motives—before the facts can be adequately explained.

One of the worst consequences, which commonly follow from such acts as Wordsworth had been hurried into, he had the courage to foresee and to avert. That is the secrecy which most men observe upon such subjects, and which is none the less degrading because it is too often accepted as a duty. From this degradation Wordsworth saved himself by making no secret of the matter. During the first years, he seems to have erred, if at all, on the side of telling too many people rather than too few. His uncles knew it; Dorothy knew it; her friend Jane Porter, Mrs Marshall, knew it; the Clarksons knew it; Mrs Wordsworth and eventually her sister Sara knew it; and at a later time, when all but the most scrupulously honest man would have taken pains to keep silence, Crabb Robinson was informed of it. With all these people, and possibly a good many more, in the secret, it had manifestly ceased to be any secret at all. Few things could be more honourable to Wordsworth than this.

There are other consequences which it was perhaps harder to foresee, and certainly harder to ward off. A man who has once been betrayed into an act of which he repents, especially when his mistake is in part due to over-confidence, may easily lose nerve for the future. Against the more obvious forms of this danger it is clear that Wordsworth was on his guard. In the ordinary affairs of life, there is no sign that he ever lost faith in himself, or ever shrank from shouldering the responsibilities which the day's task brought before him. His stalwart disregard of what other men might say or think of him was among the first things to strike the keen, but none too friendly eye of

Carlyle, when the two men met some ten or twelve years before the elder's death.

In more insidious shapes, however, it is not so clear that he escaped the timidity which the consciousness of a weak spot in his own armour might too naturally bring upon him. Was this the reason why he never published that Apology for the French Revolution, 'by a Republican,' into which he had breathed so much of the thoughts and feelings that sprang from his personal contact with the greatest event of modern times? Was it the reason, or among the reasons, why he hastily dropped those schemes for a periodical *Philanthropist*, which was to be the mouthpiece of 'that odious class of men called democrats, of which I shall for ever continue'? Was it the reason why even *The Prelude* was never published until after his death?[1] Finally, was it one of the reasons for the reaction which came over him before he had well reached middle age and which, however disproportionate the bulk assigned to it by Mr Harper, is still a thing to be reckoned with in any estimate of his life?

It is impossible to say for certain. All these things may have been due not to the dread of consequences, but to a purely constitutional shrinking from publicity, a 'delight in privacy and quiet[2],' with which any specific apprehensions may have nothing to do whatsoever. And, in the last instance cited, it is manifest that such apprehensions must have worked in a far more indirect and subtle manner than in the others. Still, in the light of our present knowledge, it is hard to resist the suspicion that they did count for something, that—in the earlier cases mentioned—they may even have turned the scale in favour of that guarded silence which, so far as his public utterances went, he maintained upon these matters to the end. And the first of these reticences at any rate it is impossible not to regret. It may be perfectly true, as Mr Harper says, that publication of the Apology might have altered the whole subsequent tenor of his life; that it might have turned him into the 'man of strife' that Milton became, with his eyes open, during the score of years in which he might naturally have looked to reap the chief harvest of his genius. It may be perfectly true that, from the peculiar bent of his genius, Wordsworth might have suffered, even more than Milton may have expected to suffer, from the sacrifice. But it is equally true that it rested solely with him to continue the strife, or to hold his hand directly the first blow had been delivered. The main thing was to declare himself, even if it were only to have done with it for ever. And, after all, something—much even—is due to courage and conviction.

Did Wordsworth make any effort to break down the barriers which parted him from Annette? did he do all that was humanly possible to

[1] It is clear that the real *Prelude* was thrown into the waste-paper basket, and that what we have is merely a revision (carried out in 1839). In the Books called *Residence in France*, the revision, both from political and personal motives, is likely to have been particularly unsparing. See Harper, II, p. 407.

[2] Letter to James Tobin, March 6th, 1798.

provide for her and the child? These are questions which are vital to a true judgment of his character. They are also questions to which, with our present knowledge, it is impossible to glean more than hints and fragments of an answer.

It has sometimes been said that he returned from France because his family, alarmed for his safety, cut off the supplies. For this belief, as Mr Harper points out, there is no authority. His original biographer —and he, so far as we know, is our only warrant in the matter—merely says that, being 'riveted to the spot by a mysterious spell,'...'he was obliged by circumstances to return to England.' This 'mysterious' phrase may cover pressure from Annette's family just as well as from his own. And the incidents related in *Vaudracour and Julia* may be thought to lend colour to this alternative conjecture. It is, however, no more than a conjecture; though, if true, it would seem to supply a more urgent reason for his departure. Yet a third explanation is offered by a statement, which Mr Harper quotes, made by 'an old Republican, named Bailey,' to the effect that he had 'warned Wordsworth that his connection with the Mountain'—rather the Girondins—'rendered his situation perilous; and the poet decamped with great precipitation.' This seems to agree with the account suggested by *The Prelude*; it is perhaps the most likely explanation of all.

There is, however, strong ground for believing that, in spite of the barriers set up by the war, he contrived to return to France in the autumn of 1793, doubtless for the sake, or in the hope, of once more seeing Annette. The evidence for this, as Mr Harper points out, is a statement made by Wordsworth himself to Carlyle (about 1840), to the effect that he witnessed the execution of Gorsas (Oct. 1793): a matter of fact about which he can hardly have been mistaken. Whether Carlyle misunderstood his words, is of course another matter. The suggestion, put forward by Mr Harper, of a later visit (1799) rests upon a manifestly wrong date (1799 for 1790) given by Wordsworth to Miss Fenwick. The mention of Robert Jones, as his companion on this occasion, puts the matter beyond doubt[1].

On the other question—what did he do for the support of mother and child?—we are left still more completely to conjecture. The one certain fact is that, as in duty bound, he made some provision for Caroline on her marriage. This appears from a letter of Dorothy's to Mrs Clarkson (Dec. 31, 1814), in which occurs the sentence: 'The journey to France will be very expensive, which we can ill afford, and the money would be better spent in augmenting my niece's wedding portion.' But that tells us nothing as to the amount. Again, from a comparison of Wordsworth's income with his expenditure during the years preceding his marriage, Mr Harper infers that the difference was sent to Annette; and it may be hoped that he is not mistaken. And with these two indications—one of them, it must be admitted, rather hazy—our knowledge comes to an end. If any further records exist in

[1] Wordsworth's *Prose Works*, ed. Grosart, III, p. 34.

private hands, it is to be hoped they will be published without more delay. The policy of concealment has broken down, as it was bound to do; and in justice to a great memory, if for nothing else, it is necessary that the whole truth should now be made known.

So much for what seems to be the first main defect of Mr Harper's valuable book: the indifferent use he has made of the new facts which he has discovered relating to Wordsworth's youth. We now turn to the other questionable point in his survey, his treatment of the poet's old age.

It must at once be admitted that, so far as the practical questions of the time went, Wordsworth ceased to live after the fall of Napoleon; that, as Crabb Robinson wrote to Dorothy (Feb. 1826), half playfully and in the character of an imaginary critic of the future, he 'survived to the fifth decennary of the nineteenth century, but appears to have died in 1814, as far as life consisted in an active sympathy with the temporary (temporal?) welfare of his fellow creatures. He had written heroically and divinely against the tyranny of Napoleon, but was quite indifferent to all the successive tyrannies which disgraced the succeeding times[1].' And there is no generous and open spirit but must bitterly regret that this was so. The more true this is, however, the more disproportionate does the space devoted by Mr Harper to this part of his subject—more than 150 pages[2]—appear to be. Under his hands, the poet is as long in dying as Clarissa or Lieutenant Lefevre. And, even if there were nothing to be said on the other side, this is surely to give a very false impression of the man's life as a whole. It is to be judged not by his blank years, but by his years of vision and insight: not by what he failed to do, but by what he did.

In fact, however, there is much to be said on the other side: many qualifying circumstances, both political and personal, which have to be taken into account.

Mr Harper—possibly from a natural unfamiliarity with the course of things in Europe and England—is far too apt to talk as though, in the political movement of the time, all the good were on one side and all the bad upon the other. It is perhaps a consequence of this that he habitually speaks of the 'party of progress' as though it were one and indivisible; as though Rousseau and Godwin, Paine and Thelwall, Brougham and Bentham had all spoken with one voice and all worked for the same ends. Nothing, in fact, could be more ludicrously unlike the truth. And, if Wordsworth was ever drawn to one or all of these men by one side of their doctrine, it by no means follows that he was bound to accept the whole system of any one of them; still less that, if he could have acted with any one of them, he could have acted with all of them together. So far, however, as all the Englishmen in this list may be taken to stand for any one range of ideas, is it not obvious that

[1] A few years later he expressed the same reproach, very delicately, in a letter to Wordsworth himself.

[2] This, however, is as nothing to the Bishop of Lincoln, who devotes nearly the whole of his second volume to this period.

this range was a very narrow, and comparatively unfruitful, one? one, moreover, with which even at the height of his revolutionary fervour—much more, in the years of his creative energy—he must have been at least as much out of sympathy as in?

Let us for a moment attempt to put ourselves in his place, as he stood at the parting of the ways during the crucial months which saw the fall of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons. One era of history was closed; another was about to open. Into the struggle now ended he had thrown his whole heart and his whole genius. Under the most favourable circumstances, it would have been hard enough for him to make face to the new scene which lay before him. And the circumstances were, in fact, as unfavourable as it was possible for them to be. It was with the Whigs and the Radicals that he ought to have ranged himself; for, with all their imperfections, it was they who in the main represented the forces of the future, the forces with which he himself had sympathised before the issue was confused by the appearance of Napoleon. But the Whigs and the Radicals had put themselves out of court. In the struggle against Napoleon they had not merely been half-hearted; they had, for the most part, been actively hostile to the national cause, which was also the cause of liberty and of Europe. The man who had staked everything upon that cause would have been more than human, if he had not regarded them with the deepest suspicion.

Nor was this all. Even apart from their subservience to Napoleon, their ideals were such as a man like Wordsworth could not possibly have accepted. They were hostile to the local liberties and the local traditions which he valued beyond all things. They cared for nothing in the life of the country but the development of its industries. And they were pure, not to say blatant, individualists. Even to the present moment we are still suffering from the completeness of their triumph. Wordsworth himself would have added yet another grievance, that they were none too friendly to the Church: a grievance which we may perhaps translate into the wider and less sectarian statement that the inner and spiritual life of the country, which to him was all-important, to them counted for little or nothing.

Such was the gulf which parted Wordsworth from the men who, at that moment, stood for the cause of freedom and of progress. Is there much wonder that he was loath to cross it? The only alternative, however, was to range himself boldly with the borough-mongers and coercionists, with the Holy Alliance and the reaction: with Liverpool and Sidmouth, with Metternich and Ferdinand VII: in other words, with those whose chief aim was to bar the way against the Revolution which he had once applauded, and to trample upon those smaller nationalities—it might be the Basques, it might be the Italians—whose struggles, so long as they were directed against Napoleon, had called forth his whole-hearted admiration. And this alternative he promptly proceeded to adopt. Ought he not to have seen that, whatever his differences with Brougham and Cartwright, they were as nothing, for the practical purposes which determine action, to those which parted him from the

men of the Regency and the Restoration? that anything in the world was better than to put himself in the same galley with George IV and Francis II, with Frederick William of Prussia, with the two Ferdinands of Spain and of Naples? Yet, however sharply he might blame their isolated acts, this was precisely what he did.

Enough has been said to show that the question was by no means so simple as Mr Harper supposes; and that, whatever course Wordsworth had chosen, some of his deepest instincts were bound to suffer cruelly both before and after the decision. So much for the political difficulties; we now pass to the more personal aspect of the question.

Mr Harper insists strongly upon the intellectual and moral deterioration which came over Wordsworth during the last thirty years or so of his long life. It may be doubted whether his estimate is correct: whether he has not made too much of straws—themselves not always proved for certain—which float upon the surface, and overlooked the silent movement of the deep current flowing beneath.

As to the presence of these alleged limitations the evidence is curiously conflicting. The two best accounts of the poet in his old age are those of Carlyle and Mill, both of which are quoted by Mr Harper. The former loudly asserts their presence; the latter, more quietly but none the less firmly, denies it. Now, of the two, it is surely clear that Mill was the better witness. His mind was better balanced and better trained; and, even if there had been no political or religious difference to put him on his guard, he was certainly not the man to give way to uncritical or ungrounded admiration. Carlyle on the other hand, as all his published utterances go to show, was the most grudging of observers. Beyond the charmed circle of Germany and his own family, it is doubtful whether he ever found pleasure in praising. His first impulse, on coming across any man of mark, was, too plainly, to pick holes. One after another, he met nearly all the noted Englishmen of his day; and Southey, saved perhaps by his comparatively modest reputation, was the only one to escape his tooth. It may be questioned whether even Goethe would have stood the ordeal of a personal interview. To Wordsworth—partly, it would appear, out of jealousy for the fame of his beloved Germans—he seems to have been especially prickly. 'Richter could have put him in his signet-ring' is the sapient verdict found in one of his Journals; and the elaborate portrait in the *Reminiscences* bears obvious traces of the same preoccupation. The portrait is brilliant in the last degree; but unfortunately it is taken through a crooked lens.

Mill's portrait is far less of a literary triumph; but it bears the stamp of truth on every line. Now the first thing to strike this young man in Wordsworth was 'the extensive range of his thoughts and feelings,' the width and balance of his judgment and 'the extreme comprehensiveness and philosophical spirit which is in him. He seems to know the pros and cons of every question; and when you think he strikes the balance wrong, it is only because you think he estimates erroneously some matter of fact.' Mill was also 'much pleased with the universality of his relish for all good poetry, however dissimilar to

his own, and with the freedom and simplicity with which every person about him seemed to be in the habit of discussing and attacking any passage or poem in his works which did not please them.' It is especially curious—for the two men met at the moment when the Reform Bill was a burning question (1831)—that Mill is careful to note that 'he talks on no subject more instructively than on states of society and forms of government.' There is not much of the intellectual fossil, or the domestic tyrant, in all this. Yet these are the two characteristics upon which Mr Harper seems most concerned to insist.

Mr Harper is disposed to attribute much of the 'narrowness' of Wordsworth's later years to his loneliness; to the fact that, after his return from Germany, he lived as a 'recluse.' The same complaint has often been made against Rousseau; and with about as much reason in one case as in the other. In truth, this is one of the phrases which pass glibly from mouth to mouth, until it occurs to someone to ask what meaning, if any, lies behind them. How much does any man, once settled in life, really 'mingle his mind,' as Johnson said, with any of those beyond the walls of his own home? A few rare spirits, with a genius for the exchange of thought, may keep the approaches open for converse of this kind—the only kind that counts—to the very end. But with most men over thirty or so it is an affair from the lips outward, and little more; it can hardly leave any trace upon their inner growth. And if this is true of men with no very strongly marked vocation, still more is it true of those whose life is given to some absorbing intellectual occupation, the first condition of which is solitary thought and study; and most of all is it the case with a man like Wordsworth or Rousseau, who has an intense spiritual experience to store up and deliver to the world. Such men are from their very nature—as both Carlyle and Harriet Martineau saw and said of Wordsworth—'solitary, isolated, impregnable'; and, however genial they may be when friendly intercourse chances to come their way, it is hard to believe that their inner life is touched in any marked degree by such chances, or that anything but loss could follow from deliberate attempts to multiply or create them. The everyday occasions of life, the common duties of the home and of ordinary good-fellowship, are enough to keep the heart open and active. And when that is once assured, all else counts for little or nothing.

After all, who can think of Wordsworth as anything but the 'recluse' of Grasmere and Rydal? and how would it have been possible for him to be what he was, or to do what he did, in any surroundings substantially other than those which he deliberately chose and which became one with him, as he with them?

In Wordsworth's case, it is further to be remembered that opportunities of meeting his intellectual equals—or as nearly such as his country had to offer—were much greater than is perhaps commonly supposed. Quite apart from his pretty frequent visits to London, there were Coleridge, Southey and the Clarksons within the reach of a stout walk; and at a later time, Arnold and Miss Martineau, Mrs Fletcher

and Lady Richardson, almost at his door; not to mention the visitors whom every summer brought in constantly growing numbers to the Lakes. And with what scorn would he have treated the suggestion that even these had more to teach him than the statesmen and cottagers of the country-side, or the children for whom, as they clung to his cloak and trousers, he cut switches from the hedge.

Mr Harper is rather severe upon the 'circle of adoring women' who lovingly guarded him and who, as the biographer seems to think, did him no good by their admiration. On this there are two things to be said. In the first place, this—or rather, the risk of this—is the price a man has to pay for the home ties he has created: ties which, in this as in other cases, were never a matter of choice, but of obligation. And in the eyes of most men, the loss, even at the worst, is small indeed in comparison with the immeasurable gain. In the second place, it may well be doubted whether the adulation was either as intense, or as damaging, as Mr Harper supposes; and whether, assuming that it was so, a few more dinner-parties, or a few more talks with Charles Lamb and Tom Poole, could have done anything to mitigate its effects. Mrs Wordsworth certainly seems to have been able to hold her own against her husband; and if there were moments when he would have wished her admiration to be more demonstrative, I do not think we need at once jump to the conclusion that his 'appetite had grown by what it fed on' from the other two ladies' hands. The evidence of Mill, quoted above, is clearly against any such construction; and a better witness than Mill it would be difficult to find.

On a review of the whole matter, it may readily be admitted that, comparatively early in middle life, a certain stiffness came over the whole being of Wordsworth; and that, after his forty-fifth year, he was little accessible either to new ideas or to new forms of poetical inspiration: and this, at a time when, if not new ideas, at least new applications of them were certainly not lacking, and when England, not for the first time in her history, had become 'a nest of singing birds.' Even so, it must be remembered that his considered judgment first of Shelley—we must take leave to forget Trelawney's rattling anecdote—and then of Tennyson was strongly, and with much insight, in their favour. It must be remembered also that his almost total inability to read set up obstacles against the entry of new thoughts and new forms of utterance which it is not easy to overrate: a fact which must also be borne in mind when we are tempted to criticise his dependence upon the 'adoring circle of women.'

But is there not something more behind? Can we resist the conclusion that in this arrest of growth, so far as it existed, there were physical causes at work? and that, if, with some notable exceptions, his creative impulse ceased at forty-five, that was because his physical frame, his vital energy, were early worn out? The passionate life of his early years, the intense concentration of his creative period, would seem to have taken more out of him than he or others were aware of. And, when we come to consider the matter, nothing could be more natural or

more likely. Few men have ever crowded so much intensity of effort as he did into the years from 1792 to 1814. And it is small wonder that the strain, of which there is abundant evidence in Dorothy's Journal, should have broken him down at an age when many men have their best work not behind them but before. Something of the same kind may be traced in Shakespeare, with whom, however, it took a different form and ended in a far earlier death. And if this be the true explanation, it is clear that the talk of narrowness and fossilisation is largely out of place and that all blame, awarded on such grounds, is inconsiderate and unjust.

That Wordsworth was touched by reaction in political matters, it would be idle to deny. To one who had seen the Revolution with his own eyes and was, moreover, so deeply out of sympathy with the ideals proclaimed by the reformers of his own country, that was natural, though regrettable, enough. But there are things which go even deeper than politics. And, in this inner region, who can believe that he ever broke with his own past? Is it conceivable that the man who wrote the *Lines above Tintern* could ever have forced his own thoughts about God within the four corners of a Church formulary, or that the poet of the *Cuckoo* and the *Daffodils* could ever have lost the vision which they brought him in his prime?

It is to be wished that Mr Harper had laid more weight upon these and kindred considerations. In default of this, his book—in many respects so valuable and so obviously a labour of love—seems to do scant justice to a great memory, and consequently to leave an impression which he himself can hardly have desired.

C. VAUGHAN.

LONDON.

Thomas Hardy. By HAROLD CHILD. (Writers of the Day.) London: T. Nisbet and Co. 1916. 8vo. ix + 120 pp.

'Unhappy the man' says the proverb 'whose fame is bigger than his means,' and many penny lanthorns have been extinguished by the splutter of contemporary laudation. That Thomas Hardy is a true luminary is revealed, if in no other way, by the imperturbability of his flame. The Johnsons, Abercrombies, Hedgcocks, and Duffins, have been unable by their united effort to perturb the bright and increasing glow of his reputation, and he has found a real exponent—to our mind—in Harold Child, who has devoted 120 pages as an Introductory Chapter to the Novels in a series which has not, so far as we know, been so well served before, and in which we see that studies are all but due upon Galsworthy, Mrs Humphry Ward, and Edith Wharton.

If asked as to the subject of Hardy's novels, one would perhaps be inclined to say that Love and the Wessex Soil are the themes of which he is fondest. One of Hardy's special contributions to the spirit of the age is his exploration of the unnoticed, forgotten, myriads of dull

prosaic average humanity, where he has discovered—here and there—lives as mysteriously interesting and as spiritually adventurous as those of queens and emperors. It was his by instinct to perceive that here and there in the world-encircling ranks of apparently commonplace humanity, are men and women with souls like Gothic cathedrals: places of endless wonder, mystery, and beauty; finding ever new crypts and hidden chapels silencing and beckoning to prayer, and it is this type of dim unapprehended personality that Hardy has so often made his own, and he has made vocal—some regard it as the supreme gift in him—the commoner folk, the servants' hall, the grave-diggers, and furze-cutters, the odd fellows, and rustics of antique England. Mr Hedgcock and Mr Duffin, with the coxcombry of graduate youth, must eternally be pitting Hardy against Meredith, and Meredith against Hardy, as we used in earlier days to hear Disraeli redressed by Gladstone and Dickens by Thackeray. Why not go further afield and compare Hardy with European reputations, such as those of Ibsen, Maupassant, Tolstoy, and France: Hardy we think would come well out of the comparison, for one of the most striking things about this quiet undemonstrative Englishman is the variety of his range; philosophy, fiction, poetry, and drama, all slow to be recognised, but all sure of arriving, and who but he has written the finest poem of the War? Fortunately Mr Child is unattracted by these academic aridities, for he is out to show us that the service of Hardy is one of the most delightful in the whole of fiction, and one of the most purposeful. His view is certainly less exhilarating than that of Shakespeare, who treats of the tragedy of character and pre-eminently of weakness. Hardy makes a large concession to the tragedy of circumstance, and does his utmost to give a stern but true picture of the struggle of individual human wills against the power indifferent to human feeling that appears to rule the world. Nature, love, power, he seems to see the insufficiency of them all, he dare not dwell too insistently on happiness; the world is very old, the life of man very brief. Over Egdon the generations of men pass ceaselessly, and leave no trace; men and women are always snatching at happiness, and breaking themselves against a power that takes no heed of them. Earthiness enters considerably into the texture of Hardy's romance and Hardy's love; confession of such facts seems almost indescribable in English after the unmitigated benignity of the school of Dickens and Thackeray. But Hardy managed somehow, even to his own detriment, to tell the truth as nearly as he could conceive it. 'The insignificance of man, the briefness of his days, are always present in Hardy's mind; he never fails to see them from the point of view of the indifferent power, and the enormous past is always present with him as a moment of time. Man would not be worth writing about, were it not for one of Mr Hardy's distinctive gifts as novelist and dramatist—what might be called his double vision. It is a peculiar gift; there is no author in whom it is so highly developed. If he sees the littleness, he sees also the greatness. Watching from infinity, he shows human life as

futile and trivial. Down in the stress and the turmoil, looking out from the very heart of some farmer or milkmaid, he shows human life heroically grand. There is no trace in his work of contempt for human will, endurance, and passion.'

Mr Child has written a primer of superlative merit, for he has rendered Hardy alluring to the outsider, while revealing much acceptable truth to those already habituated to the idiosyncrasies of the novelist. He has done it apparently by a single-minded adherence to the salient characteristics of Hardy's work, and a sedulous abstinence from what is secondary, second-hand, or irrelevant, and he has bodied forth a real portrait of a great writer. In the main line of his criticism he seems to us almost infallibly right, though there may be here and there points of annotation to which it is possible to take exception. At one point, implies Mr Child, Hardy eschews realism and falls short of sincerity. He turns the lime-light upon his rustic characters. The characters however—to our thinking—are not meant to be entirely realistic; like the Tales of his Youth from the mouth of Cobbett, another passionate lover of the soil of England, the rustic characters of Hardy are meant to be characteristic; they are a representative chorus of folk-criticism, and are used with artistic purpose similar to that of Shakespeare's Mechanicals and Grave Diggers, the Clowns of Meredith, the Peasants and Rustics of Burns and Scott. The talk of the leaders of these men, the ale-house orators of to-day, is often consummately humorous. Coggan is quite a Shakespeare character, and Hardy's conscientious objectors and milksops such as Joseph Poorgrass and Christian Cantle are entirely worthy of the maker of Slender, Shallow and Sir Andrew Ague-Cheek.

To a future generation, says the author, Hardy will be first and foremost, the author of *The Dynasts*. This is prophecy; we hope it will not come true, because if it does Hardy will be read less; epics do not last well in the reading. Nor do novels, you object. It is difficult to say at present. Hardy to our mind is an elegist among novelists and one of his prime qualities—like that of Gray—is a philosophic pathos, playing over a descriptive and humorous faculty of the finest order, and an insight into the mysteries of love upon which Mr Child utters some impressive comments, impossible for us to emulate.

The novels are grouped for us, and their transactions recapitulated with exceptional succinctness and power. It is hard to realise how difficult these *résumés* are until one has tried to make them, and even Mr Child is not infallible. For instance, in his account of *The Return of the Native* he speaks of a characteristically Hardian figure, Thomasin's brother Clym Yeobright, who is crushed by the scorn of his wife. But he wasn't crushed by the scorn of his wife, and he wasn't Thomasin's brother, as the following very characteristic passage may serve to remind our author:

'How pretty you look to-day, Thomasin!' said Clym. 'Is it because of the Maypole?'

'Not altogether.' And then she blushed and dropped her eyes, which he did

not specially observe, though her manner seemed to him to be rather peculiar, considering that she was only addressing himself. Could it be possible that she had put on her summer clothes to please him?

He recalled her conduct towards him throughout the last few weeks, when they had often been working together in the garden, just as they had formerly done when they were boy and girl under his mother's eye. What if her interest in him were not so entirely that of a relative as it had formerly been? To Yeobright any possibility of this sort was a serious matter; and he almost felt troubled at the thought of it. Every pulse of loverlike feeling which had not been stilled during Eustacia's lifetime had gone into the grave with her. His passion for her had occurred too far on in his manhood to leave fuel enough on hand for another fire of that sort, as may happen with more boyish loves. Even supposing him capable of loving again, that love would be a plant of slow and laboured growth, and in the end only small and sickly, like an autumn-hatched bird.

We are not quite sure if Mr Child does complete justice to the expressiveness of Hardy. With the exception of Mark Rutherford, it would be difficult to name among modern writers of fiction a single writer whose style is at the same time so appropriate to his material, and so extraordinarily individual as that of Thomas Hardy. Hardy's perceptiveness of mother earth, and out of the way knowledge reflected in many recondite illustrations, are notable on almost every page of his writing, but the subject of Hardy's style—though a most interesting one—is full of pitfalls, and demands almost an entire treatise to itself.

Let us end by acclaiming Mr Harold Child's primer as the shortest, though by far the completest work, that has yet appeared on the subject, one it need hardly be said of the most transcendent interest to all real lovers of *belles-lettres*.

THOMAS SECCOMBE.

CAMBERLEY.

The Cambridge Songs. A Goliard's Song Book of the Eleventh Century. Edited from the Unique Manuscript in the Univ. Library, by KARL BREUL. Cambridge: The University Press. 1915. Fol. 120 pp.

Prof. Breul's various contributions to the elucidation of the 'Cambridge Songs,' a collection of mediaeval Latin poems (narrative, erotic, laudatory and didactic), including the 'macaronic' or mixed Latin and German dialogue between monk and nun and *De Heinrico*, have appeared for the most part in German periodicals, but the major enterprise of a complete edition of this famous MS. has been made possible by the Syndics of the Cambridge Press, to whom much credit is due. From Jaffé's edition of all the songs (apart from the classical extracts) in 1867 to the present day a number of points have been raised, whose solution largely depends upon palaeographical evidence. We are here supplied with the entire part of the MS. containing the Songs in facsimile, photographed so admirably that in some cases it is even possible by the aid of a lens to decipher letters and words, which the editor was apparently unable to

distinguish on the MS. itself and omitted from the transliteration facing the facsimiles, while in others a few misreadings may be emended. Thus in the censored poems fol. 438ᵛ a, l. 28, the last word I read *miſcenti*; l. 29 *nata* should read *parata* followed by *floreſ*; and l. 30 opens with *eſt ibi m̄ſa*; l. 31 *musta* is *nesta* i.e., the continuation of *ho* on the preceding line; l. 32 I read after *quicquid*: *in cāre* (Breul, *cara*) the horizontal stroke being just visible. 438ᵛ b, 1 : *is* is wrong, for one can read *frequentiuſ*; ibid., l. 4 begins with *tiat*, the continuation of *ſilen*, l. 3; followed by *ob*; ibid., l. 8 begins with *sed* and contains *atq*: between *tas* and *clara*; 440ᵛ b, l. 30 read *applicas albis nudis* (not without significance !); 441ᵛ b, l. 35 opens with *Venuſ* and contains *gracia̅*. Many more single letters can be read, and should have found their places in the transliteration. The transcription of the other poems is correct, the only error I have noticed being the resolution of the abbreviation q̄ 433ʳ b, ll. 1 and 27 as *quid* instead of *quod*, which represents that sign elsewhere in the MS. whilst *quid* is either written in full or else shortened *q'd* (432ᵛ a, l. 35); at any rate the indiscriminate use of the old *nota* q̄ at these places would have deserved a note. Consistency has not always been attained in transcribing the connexions made by the scribe between enclitics and full words, e.g., the scribe joins *inter alia*: *apilgrimo* (436ᵛ a, l. 23), *interram* (437ʳ a, l. 28), *inlanguore* (441ᵛ b, l. 36). It is much to be regretted that no critical apparatus is given at the foot of the text. The scribe's lapses are often of significance, but more especially so his subsequent corrections. Thus the second *r* in *Herigers* (438ʳ a, l. 36), in *fratrem* (433ʳ b, l. 37) and in *fertur* (435ʳ b, l. 7) are Anglo-Saxon letters formed simply by prolonging the first down stroke of the erroneously written letter *n*—a proof of the copyist's familiarity with the long insular *r*, which immediately occurred to him as an expedient and also possibly of the presence of a Franconian *n*-like *r* in his 'Vorlage.' This correction alone would prove, even if we had no other indications, that the copyist was an Anglo-Saxon. And moreover, 434ᵛ b, l. 31, he writes *otio* for *otto* simply because he mistook the double Franconian *tt* for the Anglo-Saxon ligature ꞇ (*ti*). Other scribal emendations point to a habit of wandering ahead with the eye: *f* for *p* in *precor* (434ʳ b, l. 36) owing to *fideles*, *q* for *p* in *pace* (436ᵛ a, l. 10) owing to *quieta*, *c* for *l* in *loca* (436ᵛ b, l. 26), *l* for *r* in *fronde* (441ʳ a, l. 19) owing to *flores*. For some other reason he wrote at first *potens* for *ponens* (435ʳ b, l. 37) and *sequensi* for *sequenti* (439ʳ b, l. 12). It is a pity also that the transcribed text does not show the interesting use of the acute accent on the last syllable of a word divided at the end of a line (cf. the editor's remark, p. 25).

Following on the text is a full commentary of over 100 pages, representing the painstaking work of many years on the part of the editor; the extent of ground covered by this renders it difficult for the reviewer to attempt to do more than single out a few of the questions discussed. The careful description of the MS. in Priebsch's *Deutsche Handschriften in England*, Vol. I, pp. 16 ff. has proved very helpful for Chap. ii. The songs were probably originally composed or

at any rate collected and written down in the district of the Lower or Middle Rhine. This copy, or more probably, a second 'Abschrift' found its way to England, where is was doubtlessly recopied by an Anglo-Saxon monk[1] connected with St Augustine's, Canterbury: whilst the 'Vorlage' consisting perhaps only of loose leaves seems to have perished. There is a marked resemblance in the character of the writing to other MSS. of this period from this same monastery. To the Anglo-Saxon characteristics adduced on p. 25, should be added the predominantly insular character of certain abbreviations (e.g., ÷ or $\frac{\text{?}}{\text{?}}$ for *est*), which may now be conveniently studied in Lindsay's *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915). The open *g* occurs in the obliterated poem of the *Cleric and the Nun* in the Latin word *regnum* (438^{v} b, l. 38), occurring elsewhere with especial frequency in *De Heinrico* which is the only other 'mixed' poem in the collection. The *z* form in 434^{r} a, l. 23, etc. is paralled in the word *gaza* in *Cleopatra* B. XIII 74^{v} (eleventh cent., St Aug.). Note also the ligature 'æ' in *flectat* 437^{r} b, l. 1. On the other hand the curious mistake *tempestette* (436^{r} b, l. 2) may possibly be due to the erroneous interpretation of the *cc*-form of *a*, the first *c* being read as *e* and the second joined up to the following *t* and taken as a similar letter. The next question treated (Chapter v) is that of the owner of the 'Vorlage' and Breul here advances the theory that the codex formed the repertory of a Goliard, who compiled it as 'a song book and a commonplace book.' This it is not easy to accept on the evidence of contents. The 'Schwänke,' the *verna femine suspiria*, the *Invitatio amice* and some others may have been sung by such, but what of the historical and personal poems, the classical excerpts, the metrical experiments, the solemn church poems and above all the dialogue between monk and nun? P. S. Allen's articles in *Modern Philology*, referred to with approval by the editor, sound a warning-note here. More likely would seem the view that these miscellaneous poems were collected by some high-placed dignitary of the Church (bishop or abbot) in close touch with some of the persons celebrated in them and also familiar with both the stylistic exercises of this age and the undercurrent of popular literature embodied in Latin verse. He may have shown the book to an English guest who desired to have a copy and obtained it.

Of chief interest to the German philologist will be Chap. VII which treats of the long-debated reading of *De Heinrico*, 437^{r} a, l. 36. In his transcription Breul writes *bri . g*, explaining his omission of the *n* (cf. p. 107) on the ground that after the *bri* there is 'clearly only room for one more stroke before the *g* begins.' In this connection it was hardly necessary to draw attention to the obvious fact that the *r* is the Anglo-Saxon and not the continental letter, lest the reader might be tempted to take the second stroke of ꝛ for *i*! Again, if the spatial relations are such as Breul states, there is little excuse for his

[1] There is in spite of Breul's assertions (p. 25) no real reason for assuming more than *one* scribe for the Songs, nor do such differences in the spelling of words as *œ* and *e*, *æ*, *ę* and *e*, *y* and *i*, *c*- and *k*- (p. 26, note 1)—so common in MSS. of the period—necessitate, in any way, the inference that the original of the Songs was compiled from different MSS.

adoption of the reading *bringit* in the text on p. 48. But in fact there is very ample space between the *i* and ȝ and the reading *bꝛinȝt* which Priebsch obtained in 1894 with the help of a reagent, has now been placed beyond all doubt by the projection on a sheet of a photographic slide giving a remarkably clear picture of this portion of the MS., prepared from the facsimile itself by Mr Pittock, of University College, London, for the German Seminar library. Breul, as was to be clearly seen in the projection, has made the mistake of taking the second vertical stroke of the *n* for the down stroke of the *g* and the reason for this error of observation is probably in the ligature of the top of this downstroke on *n* with the horizontal bar of the A.S. *open g* (ȝ) whose descending stroke is of course more to the right and can be distinguished, though more faintly, together with the very distinct tail loop. The ȝ is followed immediately by *t* and there is no space whatever for an *i*, nor is there any sign of a suprascript. *Bringt* therefore, is definitely established as the MS. reading, even though, as Koegel states, it is an 'Unform,' and it is probably a simple *lapsus calami* for *bringit*, possibly owing to the disturbing influence of the A.S. form *bringð*. The scribe unfamiliar with the language made more than this one mistake in the German part of this poem (cf. Pongs, *Das Hildebrandslied*, 1913, p. 137). As to the dialect of *De Heinrico* (North Middle Franconian, p. 102) it is worthy of note that a new article by W. von Unwerth in *Paul und Braunes Beiträge*, XLI, p. 312, strives to fix Thuringia as the original home. As to the date of the historic meeting of Otto and Henry, Breul accepts the hypothesis of Meyer and Seemüller, but indicates the possibility of contamination by reminiscence of the situation of 948 and rather provokingly quotes the opening stanzas of modern poems (cf. also pp. 76, 78, 82, 84, etc.) dealing with the subject of this latter meeting. For a new hypothesis concerning the author and his date of writing, cf. Unwerth, *l.c.*, pp. 329 ff.

Points of disagreement have been emphasized in this review but without any desire to belittle the valuable labour of love which Professor Breul has accomplished. All who take a genuine interest in the studies which, to quote the words of his preface, have sustained and consoled him during these hard times, will be grateful to him for his achievement and extend a cordial welcome to this very handsome volume.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

Herder, sa vie et son œuvre. Par A. BOSSERT. Paris: Hachette et C^ie^. 1916. 8vo. iv + 206 pp.

Herder and Klopstock: a Comparative Study. By FREDERICK HENRY ADLER. New York: Stechert and Company. 1914. 8vo. 232 pp.

Herder was one of the last German writers in the eighteenth century to become known in France. While all the greater authors, and even men like Rabener, Zachariä, Gessner and Gellert rapidly attracted

attention, no translation of any of Herder's works, even fragmentary, appeared in France during his life-time. Even in the nineteenth century very little was translated, and the only critical works mentioned by Betz in his bibliography are Ch. Joret's *Herder et la Renaissance littéraire en Allemagne au 18e siècle*, Paris, 1875, and S. Karppe's *Herder, précurseur de Darwin*, Paris, 1902. G. Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique* brings us further than Betz, up to 1912, but mentions no further French books on Herder. On the other hand, there is the equally striking fact that Herder, in spite of his stay in France in 1769, when he visited the theatres and was introduced to many literary men, such as d'Alembert, Diderot, etc., remained unsympathetic towards, and, one might say, ignorant of French literature. This mutual lack of appreciation might have afforded M. Bossert a profitable subject of discussion—more profitable certainly than the theme of his half-apologetic, half-political 'Préface,' but the author of this new Herder-biography touches on little that is new or vital. He represents the older school of French criticism, light, elegant and—an unkind reviewer might add—superficial. In a book of this kind slips are not of great moment, unless they are very glaring, as, for example, the statement that Goethe began his studies in Strassburg in the spring of 1771 (pp. 54, 61) or the somewhat less astonishing mistake (p. 44): 'Il [Herder] resta quinze jours à Copenhague, où il fit la connaissance de Lessing.' Lessing's letter to Ebert of 3rd March, 1770 (Hempel, XXI, p. 349) shows that the place of meeting was Hamburg.

It is perhaps unfair to compare this biography with the standard works of Haym and Kühnemann, but, on the other hand, if it cannot bear comparison, which it certainly cannot, and if it conveys no new information, which it also does not, the question of its superfluousness arises. Even if we take it as a 'short' life of Herder, there are important omissions; and many points, such as Kant's influence on Herder in Königsberg, the discussion of the *Fragmente* and the *Kritische Wälder*, are very summarily dealt with. Hardly anything is said about the *Volkslieder*, and the *Cid* is disposed of in nine lines of feeble generalisation. The last point is typical and significant. The *Cid* and its sources have been investigated by Mönnich and Vögelin, and we should expect a biographer to refer to the fact, if not to summarize the result of these investigations. The little facts of a man's family and official life are interesting enough—and Bossert supplies these—but the serious student has profounder interests. Even in a small book a greater effort might have been made to reveal and illuminate the soul and mind of Herder, that strange individuality with so many diverse gifts and such curious weaknesses and antipathies. With Haym and Kühnemann already in the field, this was the most important task that a biographer of Herder could set himself. The book has neither index nor bibliography.

Dr Adler's work confines itself to a strictly limited field. The First Part deals, in three chapters, with the personal relations of Klopstock and Herder, and with Herder's knowledge and appreciation of Klopstock's writings, particularly the *Messiah* and the lyrical poems. In the Second

Part, consisting of three chapters entitled 'The Conception of the Poet,' 'Religious Views' and 'Patriotic Endeavours,' the author shows how important new ideas, appearing first in Klopstock, were taken up by Herder and expressed in his writings. A supplementary chapter, 'Treatment of Poetical Language,' seeks to prove the close relation on the one hand between the poetical language of Klopstock and his predecessors, the Pietists of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and on the other between the intellectual worlds of Klopstock and of Herder. In this last chapter the author is on slippery ground, where generalisations are very dangerous. Can we, for example, take Schönaich, when he speaks in his *Neue Aesthetik* as the mouthpiece of Gottsched's school and attacks the new poetry of Klopstock, as a criterion of normal poetical usage and conclude that the words he objects to are an 'absolute innovation' of Klopstock's? Surely Schönaich had to score his points somehow! And are not many of the words he objected to (Adler, pp. 157, 180, 186, 196) the common stock-in-trade of all poetry, from the use of which by any author at a definite time no certain conclusions can be drawn? Examples are the words: Abend, blitzen, dämmern, Donner, dunkel, Frühling, golden, hell, Mutter, Natur, Sonne, ruhen, weinen, Thränen. It seems questionable, again, whether Dr Adler does not exaggerate the ultimate influence of Klopstock and Herder on German politics. Difference of opinion may well arise here, but the last sentence on p. 147 seems to us to go too far: 'Although the ultimate problem of political organization was left for the great minds of the nineteenth century to solve, and unification did not become an accomplished fact till 1871, we can safely say that such a result would have been impossible without the noble endeavours of such great men as Herder and Klopstock.' Turning to the rest of the book, we have nothing but praise for the first five chapters, where the author pursues his investigation with a convincing thoroughness and soundness of judgment which do credit to his training and are productive of important new results. Here and there a word might be altered: 'holy shudder' (p. 76) is not English; 'Erzählungen' (p. 100) is 'narrative' rather than 'prose'; 'obsolute' (p. 151) is a misprint for 'absolute'; and 'ein genialer Orientaler' is not 'a genial Oriental.' These, however, are very minor points in an excellent piece of work, which the student of German will find both interesting and stimulating.

JOHN LEES.

ABERDEEN.

Wolfgang Goethe. Af GEORG BRANDES. 2 Vols. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel. 1915. 8vo. 380 + 356 pp.

More than ten years ago, in the course of a review article on Dr Brandes, I ventured the criticism that in all the twelve huge volumes of his Collected Works, he had strangely little to say about Goethe. Dr Brandes wrote me at that time: 'You have done me some injustice

with respect to Goethe. I have written half a score of essays about him, more than about any other man. When I omitted all these from my Collected Writings, it was merely because they are some day to form a larger book and because there was no room for them. No one have I worshipped as I have worshipped Goethe ("Ingen har jeg dyrket som Goethe")'. The present volumes are clearly the fulfilment of that intention.

Dr Brandes takes upon himself here the task of reconciling the idolisation of Goethe by the Germans with the 'coolness towards the poet, which is so frequently to be observed in France and England.' 'Goethe philology,' he says, 'so well justified on German soil, has elsewhere had an effect of frightfulness. The learned terrorism which finds it culpable to refuse attention, even admiration, to anything whatever that Goethe wrote, has stung non-German readers and scholars to adverse criticism.' Possibly we might draw a further inference from the publication of this work in the midst of these unhappy times, that Dr Brandes would have his countrymen not confuse the modern Prussian and his appalling materialism and barbarism with the great people whose heritage is the High German tongue, a people which, in the eighteenth century, had so little in common with its northern hybrid neighbour that it could produce the most humanely European of the great poets of the world. The problem Dr Brandes sets himself is: 'What is Goethe? What can he be to-day to non-Germans, to the important minority of spiritually endowed men and women without national and religious prejudices, who have not language in common with him, nor the boundless reverence towards him which is a natural consequence of common speech and nationality, but who are attracted by genuine greatness and do not shrink from the small, but necessary effort to get into intimate touch with him?' As, however, is almost inevitable in those who busy themselves with Goethe, our author is so carried away by the enthralling interest of his theme, that he forgets to tell us what this or that work or side of the poet's activity means or ought to mean to us non-Germans.

The Danes already possess one of the best lives of Goethe written outside Germany, that by P. Hansen and Raphael Meyer, published in 1906; but Brandes' book is a much more personal and original work than this. He has approached Goethe in a way peculiarly his own: there is less of the German traditional criticism here, and a more individual and subjective note. He has not, it is true, attempted to re-create Goethe, as he re-created our own Shakespeare: no doubt, mainly because there are too many documented facts about Goethe's life to leave room for speculative reconstruction on any large scale. But he has avoided the mere repetition of the things everyone else feels it his duty to say about Goethe. He throws light on points that have hitherto been overlooked, and with the fine artistic sense, which has never deserted him since, in studies like that on Schack Staffeldt, he set up a new model for the critical essay, he has distributed light and shade, thrown into relief here, into shadow there, in order to bring about just the effect and impression he aims at producing. One might, indeed,

say that the most characteristic feature of this criticism of Goethe is the attention which is given to points in Goethe's life and work which have hitherto been ignored. By bringing into prominence picturesque little facts which had escaped more learned and ponderous biographers, Brandes often invests arid biographical tracts—for there are such even in Goethe's life—with an unexpected interest. He deals with Goethe's minor works with unusual fulness, while the important works do not always tempt him proportionately. He is, for instance, an enthusiastic admirer of the *Urfaust*, but perfunctory in his treatment of the First Part of *Faust*. He looks at *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* from what is, in many respects, a new angle—the *Bekenntnisse einer schönen Seele* are lucidly analysed—whereas he has too much to say about the often trivial stories which form the padding of the *Wanderjahre*, and nothing at all about the ethical and religious ideas behind that work. On *Werther* he is disappointingly meagre, while on *Die Wahlverwandtschaften* he has, as might be expected in a writer who has followed with such close interest the development of psychological fiction, a great deal to tell us that is fresh.

Goethe's friends and *entourage* are dealt with in great detail. Lenz, Klinger, Jacobi, for instance: also Frau von Stein, who seems to be a particular *bête noire* of the author's—'no one ever treated Goethe worse than Frau von Stein'—and the Weimar circle generally. On Schiller he has done me the honour of adopting certain unorthodox views which I put forward in a little book on that poet, published some ten years ago; but, coming upon these now in the cold print of another tongue, I feel that they might with advantage have been modified just a little in the direction of German orthodoxy. Dr Brandes finds room for a chapter on Goethe in France, based on Professor Baldensperger's work, and one on Goethe in England, which, unfortunately, is meagre and inaccurate. Carlyle did not translate Schiller's *Thirty Years' War*, and it is far from just to describe his essay on the *Death of Goethe* in the *New Monthly Magazine* as 'nothing but a mediocre funeral oration.'

Brandes lays stress in conclusion on Goethe's power of creating living men and women as the crowning virtue of his genius: and he rightly claims that his women are usually better than his men. 'Goethe,' to to quote his concluding words, 'has in a supreme degree the form-moulding power ("skikkelsedannende Evne"): he can create human beings of the clay of art and give them life: and he has at the same time the gift of the scientific investigator; he explains the Universe, the existence of the world. He has revealed to men that in the Eden of Art and Science, the trees of life and of knowledge are merely one.'

J. G. Robertson.

London.

Études sur Grillparzer. (Grillparzer et la nature, Grillparzer et l'amour, Grillparzer et les races.) Par A. TIBAL. Paris et Nancy, Berger-Lerrault, 1914. 8vo. 236 pp.

The student of Grillparzer should refresh his memory by reading the *Selbstbiographie* before applying himself to M. Tibal's book. In the first essay the poet's attitude towards nature is examined and strong features of resemblance to Rousseau are discovered. The precise description of scenery in the plays is in harmony with the poet's conception of the drama as a spectacle. M. Tibal's account of Grillparzer's youth rapidly creates an atmosphere about him which we have no difficulty in accepting as genuine, but which the austere style of the *Selbstbiographie* does not effectively preserve. M. Tibal notes how the poet's feeling for nature was affected by his imperfect vision and that it flags in later years, which is not at all remarkable. But the important fact remains that not only is Grillparzer careful to describe the exact nature of the landscape in which his characters move, but he makes it react upon their temperament. Summer and winter, dawn and twilight, sun and moon are used with distinct dramatic intention.

In the second essay we are made to realize the fundamental importance of love in Grillparzer's work. Love is to him the direct revelation of nature and takes precedence of all other passions. Its chief characteristics, according to Grillparzer, are selfishness, impatience, and the entire submission which in real life he himself required from the objects of his affection. These features he admits in a thinly veiled confession of resemblance to Rousseau. M. Tibal's essay concludes with a sympathetic and acute discussion of the poet's heroes and heroines.

The third essay deals mainly with Grillparzer's admiration of Greek and Spanish literature and his detestation of German methods in literature, criticism, philosophy, religion and politics. Speaking of his visit to Berlin he says, 'Nun hat aber die deutsche Bildung das Eigenthümliche, dass sie sich gar zu gern von dem gesunden Urtheile und der natürlichen Empfindung entfernt. Auch war mir die Einstimmigkeit der litterarischen Meinungen zuwider.' Such utterances as these abound in Grillparzer's reminiscences, but M. Tibal exercises judicial restraint in his comments and cannot be accused of making an unfair use of the material he found ready to his hand.

G. WATERHOUSE.

DUBLIN.

Historia da Litteratura Portugueza. III. *Os Seiscentistas.* Por THEOPHILO BRAGA. Porto: Lelo and Irmão. 1916. 688 pp.

It would be indeed a miracle if Dr Theophilo Braga's works were as accurate and as valuable as they are voluminous. He has been publishing books for over fifty years and during all that time he has written in a whirlwind, without a moment's pause for method or

restraint. Some years ago he began a summary of his still incomplete History of Portuguese Literature. It was to consist of three volumes. The first, *Edade Media*, appeared in 1909, the second, *A Renascença*, five years later. In the third the idea of a summary is thrown to the winds; the book deals exclusively with the seventeenth century and consists mainly of a review of Mr Edgar Prestage's life of D. Francisco Manuel de Mello (Coimbra, 1914) and of the studies by Dr Ricardo Jorge and Dr Antonio de Vasconcellos on Rodriguez Lobo and Braz Garcia de Mascarenhas. Nearly half the volume is devoted to Mello, but, beyond hypotheses, nothing new is added to the facts discovered by Mr Prestage —with the exception of the letter of pardon granted to Mello by Affonso VI in 1662 (pp. 370–2). When Dr Braga has nothing to say he has recourse to quotation and apparently it matters little whether the quotation be apposite or not. The case of the epic poet Francisco de Sá de Meneses is typical. Of the six pages allotted to him (pp. 518–24) four and a half are occupied with a quotation concerning the Kings of Malay. Dr Braga then, in an heroic attempt to account for his quotation, declares that it shows how the epic poets abandoned tradition for 'the trivial rhetoric of Jesuit humanism,' and turns to another subject. With many of the opinions expressed in this book it is impossible to agree. Mello was scarcely a great poet, nor was his *O Fidalgo Aprendiz* a lyrical masterpiece. Antonio Vieira is represented as an empty rhetorician whereas his style and his policy were never, or never long, divorced from hard fact. Frei Luis de Sousa is blamed (p. 646) for inserting details which constitute not the least charm of his works. The style of Manoel Bernardez, perhaps the most precise and vigorous in the language, is dismissed (p. 655) as 'unctuous.' As one might expect in a book obviously written in haste, there are numerous misprints and slips. Jacinto Freire de Andrade becomes Jacinto Ferreira (p. 559), *Aganippe* becomes *Agaripe* (pp. 406, 409). These oversights are indeed too numerous to quote. English names suffer badly: Cromwell, Laud, Buchanan, Whitehall are all misspelt. The name of the German historian Schaefer is given in two forms, neither of which is correct. But perhaps the most extraordinary mark of ill-considered haste occurs on pp. 575–6. Ticknor had remarked that Gracian's *El Criticon* might be described as a Spanish counterpart to the work of Bunyan which Dr Braga here twice calls *Pilgrim Progress*. Dr Braga infers from this that Gracian 'imitated' Bunyan. But he goes further: misled by the title of Alexandre de Gusmão's work—*Historia do Predestinado Peregrino* (1682)—he says that this is a translation of Bunyan's book, and accuses the author of plagiarism for not declaring his work to be a translation (whereas it is nothing of the kind). Gusmão's real crime is that he was a Jesuit. Dr Theophilo Braga has rendered great services to Portuguese literature during half a century of constant labour, and it is to be hoped that he will render more. We wish to have his mature judgments, but we would have them less carelessly and hurriedly expressed and not set in a mass of haphazard, often inaccurate quotations. In the present instance a few

paragraphs of valuable matter are padded out to nearly 700 pages, so that the volume resembles a scrap-book or a wastepaper-basket rather than a work of literary history or criticism.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL.

MINOR NOTICES

Signor Federico Olivero is an accomplished English scholar, and has already done much to make modern English literature familiar to his countrymen. In his *Traduzioni dalla Poesia Anglo-Sassone* (Bari: G. Laterza, 1915) he gives extracts from *Beowulf* and a selection of Anglo-Saxon poems translated into Italian prose, which is clear, simple and faithful. The Introduction covers familiar ground, and shows that he has read the usual English and German authorities. It will be useful to Italians who are approaching the subject for the first time; but it contains no new ideas. We look in vain for a fresh Italian point of view.

J. S. S.

Professor G. L. Kittredge has some right to speak about Chaucer; he has not got up the subject in a hurry; he knows what he has to say, and his knowledge goes far beyond the immediate scope of these lectures, delivered in 1914 in the Johns Hopkins University and now published under the title *Chaucer and his Poetry* (London: H. Milford, 1915). In these lectures he gives his opinion about Chaucer in a way that should encourage younger students, and teach them to use their own judgment, and not accept what Mr Kittredge in one place calls 'the ordinary appraisal' of the poet. This is where he is describing the *Book of the Duchess*, and this, the second lecture, may be recommended particularly as a specimen of the author's fresh and original reading in familiar and often studied ground.

The interpretation of the *House of Fame*, especially the First Book, is likewise different from the ordinary way, and very satisfactory in its treatment of forced allegorical explanations. And so on, through all his survey, Mr Kittredge in dealing with the best known matters is able to set his audience thinking, if they have a mind. It will not be his fault if they fail to understand.

In some places there is room for criticism. 'The Troilus stanza, likewise his invention'—a note is wanted to explain that Chaucer's invention was appropriation from the French; and reference to Provençal and Italian would not have been superfluous. Students of the art of verse may be found anywhere, and many of them would be thankful for direction to the right places where examples of form may be found.

Mr Kittredge still holds the regrettable view that the 'airish beasts' in the *House of Fame* are the signs of the zodiac. Has he thought over all that this strange heresy implies? As the signs of the zodiac are in the eighth sphere, it follows that Chaucer and the eagle, passing above them, must at least have attained the *Primum Mobile*, if not the Empyrean. And what is the meaning of 'airish'? The signs of the zodiac are high in the heavenly ether. Does not the *Somnium Scipionis* make it clear to everyone that the air belongs to the sublunar sphere where things are subject to decay? The House of Fame is still some distance on this side of the moon, and Chaucer does not rise even to the lowest limit of ethereal space. I may be allowed to refer to my note on this passage in the *Modern Quarterly* for August 1899, which as far as I can tell has never yet been read by anyone.

W. P. K.

Mr G. F. Richardson is a student of economics and also, if in a lesser degree, of literature; and it was well that he should ask the question how and where, in the case of the 'romantic movement,' the two phenomena may be related. He does not seem, nor indeed does he claim, to get very far with the answer. His thesis, *A Neglected Aspect of the English Romantic Revolt*, appears in the publications (Modern Philology Section, Vol. III, No. iii, pp. 247–360) of the University of California (Berkeley, May 1915). What is the bond between literature (from Pope to Shelley inclusive) and the complex body of changes, social, economic, and mental, which that literature partially discloses? How do literature and *its* changes fit into the history? Mr Richardson, in laying siege to this problem, trenches far afield, and gives a chapter to the 'industrial revolution' and its effects; then he seeks to link those effects with traits like 'individualism,' 'philanthropy,' 'radicalism,' and 'naturalism' (by which is meant love of nature). These traits, we all know, are mirrored in poetry, fiction, the essay, and controversial writing. Some of the links are suggestively indicated. 'Individualism,' which in the sphere of art makes us think of Byron and Shelley or of the *Everlasting Gospel*, is quickened, in the practical sphere, by the break-up of old class-barriers, by the new sharpness of commercial competition, and by the fresher interchange of population between town and country (pp. 308–315). It is also to the purpose to remark (p. 298) that 'the appearance of Richardson and his followers is evidence that the middle class is rising again in the social scale.' But, in general, Mr Richardson's attempt to explain the poets and novelists, or their works, on these lines becomes highly involved. He steps from one *-ism* to another—naturalism, humanitarianism, sentimentalism—too quickly and lightly, and the argument becomes elusive. The precise points of junction between the economic or social data and the artistic result are extremely hard to make out. One reason of this may be that Mr Richardson's literary judgments are not always happy. He speaks

(p. 251) of 'the inane flights of the Marinistic or "Metaphysical" poets,' as if the epithets were equivalent, and as if those poets were all inane. Crabbe (p. 304) is a 'religious sentimentalist'; Fielding, the 'genial realist,' is ranked (p. 302), 'perhaps with justice,' among persons 'brutally indifferent' to suffering. The eighteenth century was 'dominated by French influence.' Mr Richardson's English is sometimes strange, and some very common names, as well as other words, are misspelt. Altogether the essay, though it contains valuable material, needs clarifying not a little if its ambition is to be fulfilled.

O. E.

The compelling cause of Dr Frederick E. Pierce's *Selections from the Symbolical Poems of William Blake* (New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1915) is perhaps to be found in a criticism passed by Professor O. Elton on Blake's *Jerusalem*: 'This poem can only disgust save in selections, but without such selections the genius of the writer will not be understood. It contains long passages of rare and achieved beauty.' If we are right, thanks are due to Professor Elton as well as to Dr Pierce for a book which will bring moments of exquisite pleasure to many readers to whom Blake's prophetic books have hitherto been only repulsive. Dr Pierce has done his part well, he has made an admirable selection of passages and he has prefixed to each a little note of kindly guidance to the reader. His Introduction is a piece of tersely expressed and admirable criticism, and he has found a most happy motto from Byron's *Manfred*. One may quote the last words:

> He will perish,
> And yet he must not; I will try once more,
> For such are worth redemption.

The noble poetry buried in the prophetic books was indeed worth redemption. One catches echoes now of the Old Testament, now of Milton, now of Ossian: notes again that prelude Walt Whitman. And what has been said of Walt Whitman's verse is perhaps true of Blake's: it prospers best when it is only rhythmical, without becoming metrical. Among lines which are not metrical, the occurrence of some of regular metrical form produces a jar. But Blake's poetry is not all of the grandiose or rhapsodical order; here and there it has little delicate beauties which recall Wordsworth and Keats. The poet's imagination can project itself into the heart of a bird, a tree, a seed, an insect:

> See'st thou the little wingèd fly, smaller than a grain of sand,
> It has a heart like thee, a brain open to heaven and hell.
>
> The spider sits in his laboured net, eager, watching for the fly.
> Presently comes a famished bird and takes away the spider.
> His web is left all desolate that his little anxious heart
> So careful wove and spread it out with sighs and weariness.

the seed waits eagerly watching for its flower and fruit,
Anxious its little soul looks out into the clear expanse
To see if hungry winds are abroad with their invisible array.

the tree knoweth not what is outside its leaves and bark,
And yet it drinks the summer joy, and fears the winter sorrow.

A rock, a cloud, a mountain
Were now not vocal as in climes of happy eternity...
.....when [? where] the cloud, the furrows and the field
Talk with the husbandman and shepherd.

Did any poet write of the lark with more imagination than in the lines:

The lark sitting upon his earthy bed, just as the morn
Appears, listens silent: then springing from the waving Cornfield, loud
He leads the Choir of Day—trill, trill, trill, trill,
Mounting upon the wings of light into the Great Expanse,
Re-echoing against the lovely blue and shining heavenly Shell,
His little throat labours with inspiration; every feather
On throat and breast and wings vibrates with the effluence Divine.
All Nature listens silent to him, and the awful Sun
Stands still upon the Mountain looking on this little Bird
With eyes of soft humility, and wonder, love, and awe.

At times Blake passes from adoration to something like sarcasm:

There is a place where Contrarieties are equally True.
This place is called Beulah. It is a pleasant lovely Shadow
Where no dispute can come, because of those who Sleep...
There is from Great Eternity a mild and pleasant rest
Named Beulah, a soft, moony universe, feminine, lovely,
Pure, mild and gentle, given in Mercy to all those who sleep.

Probably Blake had stayed at Tunbridge Wells.

G. C. M. S.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PB
1
M65
v.11

The Modern language review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY